GREGORY SCHOPEN

ON AVOIDING GHOSTS AND SOCIAL CENSURE: MONASTIC FUNERALS IN THE MŪLASARVĀSTIVĀDA-VINAYA

Funeral rites and burial practices in Indian Buddhist monasteries have received very little scholarly attention. This is, perhaps, because such rites and practices — like those in so many other religious traditions — call clearly into question the degree to which "official" and purportedly "central" doctrines were known to the members of actual Buddhist monastic communities, or — if known — the degree to which they had actual impact on behavior. This may be particularly annoying to modern scholars of Buddhism because they seem to like "official" literary doctrine, and seem to want to think — in spite of the apparent absence of good evidence — that it somehow had importance beyond a narrow circle of scholastic specialists. It is, however, perhaps more certainly true that certain statements made by early and good scholars did little to direct attention towards such rites and practices. Hermann Oldenberg, as early as 1881, said ". . . the Vinaya texts are nearly altogether silent as to the last honours of deceased monks. To arrange for their cremation was perhaps committed to the laity".[1] T. W. Rhys Davids went even further only eighteen years later. "Nothing is known", he said, "of any religious ceremony having been performed by the early Buddhists in India, whether the person deceased was a layman, or even a member of the order. The Vinaya Piṭaka, which enters at so great length into all details of the daily life of the recluses, has no rules regarding the mode of treating the body of a deceased Bhikkhu".[2]

That such statements would not have encouraged further research would hardly be surprising. If, too, they were entirely correct, there would be little need for it. But they are not. There are at least two things wrong with statements of this kind. First of all, both Oldenberg and Rhys Davids — like so many scholars still — axiomatically assumed that evidence for Buddhist practices can only be found in texts, that texts and texts alone reflect what actually occurred. It does

Journal of Indian Philosophy **20**: 1—39, 1992.

not seem to matter that there was and is clear epigraphical and archeological evidence that proves that Buddhist monastic communities at Sāñci, Sonari, Andher and Bhojpur, at Bhaja, Bedsa and Kanheri, at Amaravati and Mathura were concerned — even pre-occupied — with ritually depositing and elaborately housing the remains of at least some of the local monastic dead. It does not seem to matter that a good deal of this evidence was available long before either Oldenberg or Rhys Davids were writing, or that a good deal of it dates to the earliest period of Buddhist monasticism that we have certain knowledge of.[3] But even if we put aside — as we must here — this epigraphical and archeological evidence,[4] the fact remains that both Oldenberg's and Rhys Davids' statements are still distortive. Both refer to "*the* Vinaya", but that meant for them — as it still means for many — only the Pāli *Vinaya*. We now know, however, that the Pāli *Vinaya*, in fact the Pāli canon as a whole, is — in K. R. Norman's words — "a translation from some earlier tradition, and cannot be regarded as a primary source", that in some cases the Pāli *Vinaya* is "markedly inferior" to the other *Vinayas*, and in some cases appears decidedly later.[5] Moreover, Csoma's analysis of the Tibetan *'dul ba*, published almost fifty years before Oldenberg, contained enough in summary form to make it clear that if the Pāli *Vinaya* as we have it had "no rules regarding the mode of treating the body of a deceased Bhikkhu", the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* did.[6] Rockhill's extracts from the same *Vinaya* — published only two years after Oldenberg and six before Rhys Davids — should have put this beyond all doubt.[7] This Mūlasarvāstivāda material, however, was and has remained largely ignored, while Oldenberg's, and especially Rhys Davids', assertions — although demonstrably distorted if not entirely wrong — have come to be taken as established fact. P. V. Kane, for example, in his influential *History of Dharmaśāstra* simply paraphrases Rhys Davids' remarks concerning the Buddhist treatment of their dead.[8] This clearly will not do, and the Mūlasarvāstivāda material — available in part in Sanskrit from the Gilgit manuscripts,[9] in part from a partial and far from perfect Chinese translation,[10] and in its entirety in the Tibetan Kanjur — needs to be brought fully into the discussion. There have already been, to be sure, limited and partial attempts to do this, notably by L. de La Vallée Poussin.[11] What follows is only, I hope, a more concerted

attempt to be added to those that have gone before, but it too remains very much in the category of the tentative: it is based only on a far from full familiarity with two *Vinayas*; it does not take into account the important monastic codes preserved in Chinese — but hopefully might stimulate others to do so; it does not solve — but in fact exiles to the forest of footnotes or ignores — numerous lexical, terminological and textual problems which are encountered in these legalistic codes; it merely suggests — it does not necessarily establish — some possible lines of interpretation which might or might not prove fruitful. It does, however, I think, make more fully available some interesting data.

There are literally dozens of references to the death of a local monk in both the Pāli *Vinaya* and the *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, but the bulk of these in both *Vinayas* occur in what at first sight might seem an unlikely place. In both *Vinayas* the death of a local monk is treated most fully in their respective "section on robes or robe-material" (*Cīvaravastu, Cīvarakkhandhaka*). The explanation for this, however, seems to be that the death of a local monk raised for the Vinaya masters one of the same problems that death in almost every community, whether secular or religious, raises: the problem of property and inheritance. Since the "robe" was one of the primary items of personal property that belonged to a monk, and since inheritance might be an important means by which other monks might acquire robes, it is only natural that the disposition of a deceased monk's property would be discussed together with the other means of legitimately acquiring robes and the rules governing such acquisition. In the Pāli *Cīvarakkhandhaka* inheritance of a monk's property is not heavily legislated or encumbered. The formal rules are kept to a minimum. Typical is the first promulgation in this regard: two monks tend to a sick monk who dies. They take the deceased monk's robe and bowl and report his death to the Buddha. The latter says:

> Monks, the Order is the owner of the bowl and robes of a monk who passed away. But truly those who tend the sick are of great service. I allow you, monks, to give through the Order the three robes and the bowl to those who tended the sick.[12]

The formal procedure is then explained. This relatively simple legisla-

tion becomes, of course, more complicated when the property of a dead monk is more extensive, when, for example, it involves both what the texts call "biens légers" (*lahu-bhaṇḍa, lahu-parikkhāra*) and "biens lourds" (*garu-bhaṇḍa, garu-parikkhāra*).[13] But on the whole the Pāli *Vinaya* legislates far fewer situations than does the *Mūlasarvāsti-vāda-vinaya*, and limits itself to the enunciation of a few general principles. The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, on the other hand, devotes nearly thirty-five pages to the disposition of a dead monk's property, taking pains to make detailed rulings on a large range of specific situations.[14]

There has been a clear tendency to explain differences of this sort in the Vinayas as reflections of differences of chronology, to see an increase in number and specificity of rules as an indication of later composition. But this explanation — though a favorite of Western scholars — is only one explanation, and a very narrow one at that. It completely overlooks a number of other equally possible explanations. It is equally possible, for example, that what has been taken as a reflection of a chronological difference may in fact reflect "sectarian" differences in legal rigorism which need not involve any chronological component at all. Looked at in this light the Pāli rules governing the disposition of a deceased monk's property may simply have been loose, if not lax. They would have allowed a fair amount of ambiguity and leeway for individual judgement. The compilers of the *Mūla-sarvāstivāda-vinaya* appear to have intended to prevent both and to frame a far stricter and more comprehensive code, a code in which little was left to an individual's or local community's discretion. The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* may, then, represent a far stricter rule, rather than a later one.

The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* also appears to be straightforward about the kind and range of problems that could arise in the distribution of a dead monk's property. It contains, for example, the following detailed case which concerns a monk named Upananda who had amassed a considerable estate.[15] The community at Śrāvastī, after establishing its right to the estate which was initially impounded by the King, proceeded with its distribution among the monks in Śrāvastī. But then the monks from Sāketā heard about Upananda's death and came to claim a share (*asmākam api bhadantopanandaḥ sabrahmacārī.*

asmākam api tatsantako lābhaḥ prāpadyata iti). As a result, the text says: *bhikṣubhiḥ pātayitvā taiḥ sārdhaṃ punar api bhājitaḥ*, "after having brought (the estate) together again, the monks (of Śrāvastī) once more divided it together with those (monks from Sāketā)". But this too was not the end. Monks from Vaiśāli, Vārāṇasī Rājagṛha and Campā came and the whole procedure had to be repeated again and again. The situation reached the point that, according to the text: *bhikṣavaḥ pātayanto bhājayantaś ca riñcanty uddeśaṃ pāṭhaṃ svādhyāyaṃ yogaṃ manasikāram*, "the monks (because they were always) bringing together and dividing (estates), abandon (their) instruction, recitation, study, yoga and mental concentration".[16] The Buddha is informed of the situation and as a consequence he declares:

pañca karaṇāni lābhavibhāge. katame pañca. gaṇḍī tridaṇḍakaṃ caityaṃ śīlākā jñaptiḥ pañcakam. yo mṛtagaṇḍyām ākoṭyamānāyām agacchati, tasya lābho deyaḥ. evaṃ tridaṇḍake bhāṣyamāṇe caityavandanāyāṃ kriyamāṇāyāṃ śīlākā[yām ā]caryamāṇāyām. tasmāt tārhi bhikṣavaḥ sarvaṃ mṛtapariṣkāraṃ jñaptiṃ kṛtvā bhājayitavyam. akopyaṃ bhaviṣyati.[17]

There are five occasions for the distribution of (a deceased monk's) possessions. Which five? The gong; the Tridaṇḍaka; the caitya; the ticket; the formal motion is the fifth. Who, when the gong for the dead is being beaten, comes — to him something is to be given. It is the same for when the Tridaṇḍaka is being recited, when the worship of the caitya is being performed, when tickets are being distributed, [when a formal motion is being made].[18] Therefore, then, monks, having made a formal motion concerning all the personal belongings of the deceased, they are to be distributed. It will be a fixed procedure [which is then described].[19]

A passage such as this is an explicit recognition that Buddhist monastic communities had a wide range of potentially conflicting concerns and preoccupations, all of which were accepted as legitimate. Notice that concern with the distribution of a deceased monk's property is not here — nor in the Pāli *Cīvara-kkhandhaka* — in itself ever criticized. It is presented as perfectly legitimate. A problem arises, or a situation requiring legislation appears, only when that concern distracts monks or communities from other legitimate concerns. In the present case there is no hint that one set of concerns was considered more important than the other. The problem was to accommodate both. Since there is no legislation in the Pāli *Vinaya* for the particular situation addressed in this Mūlasarvāstivādin passage, and yet we know that the kinds of activities involved were known to, and

recognized as legitimate concerns of a monastic community by the compilers of the Pāli *Vinaya*, we might be able to see in this Mūlasarvāstivādin passage another good example of the consistent tendency on the part of its compilers to insist on a far stricter and more comprehensive code than was framed in the Pāli *Vinaya*. Again, chronological considerations need not enter in. It is, finally, also important to note that this passage presents us with the first direct indication of the intimate connection in the *Cīvara-vastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* between the distribution of a deceased monk's property and what it presents as the proper performance of his funeral: the first of the "occasions" for the distribution mentioned in this passage, and very probably the second and third as well, are — as we shall see — particular moments in a Mūlasarvāstivādin monastic funeral. We know — again as we shall see — from a variety of Mūlasarvāstivādin sources that the sounding of "the gong or bell for the dead" (called variously the *mṛta-*, *anta-* or *muṇḍikā gaṇḍī* in Sanskrit,[20] and *shi ba'i gaṇḍī* or *gaṇḍī mjug* (v.l. *'jug*) *med pa* in Tibetan[21]) was used "pour l'annonce d'une mort", and appears to have signalled the beginning of the formal funeral proceedings.[22] We know too that the recitation of the Tridaṇḍaka,[23] or giving a recitation of Dharma (*dharmaśravaṇaṃ dattaṃ*)[24] or of "the Dharma connected with the Impermanent" (*mi rtag pa dang ldan pa'i chos dag bshad nas*)[25] took place at the end of, or during, the cremation, and that "worshipping the Stūpa or caitya" (*mchod rten la phyag 'tshal bar bya'o*) appears to have formally terminated the proceedings as a whole.[26] The moments chosen for the distribution of a dead monk's property do not appear to have been arbitrary, but appear initially to have been closely linked to significant moments in his funeral. The order in which they occur also does not appear to be arbitrary, but seems to reflect a sequence of moments which are increasingly removed from the moment of death and would appear to involve a decreasing degree of participation in the funeral activities. He "who, when the gong for the dead is being beaten, comes" is present and participates from the very commencement of the funeral. But he who comes "when the worship of the caitya is performed" need only be present at the end, and he who comes only "when a formal motion is being made" need not have been present at all. That the 'first' moment is 'first' in more than just a numerical sense and involves both a

priority in time and a priority of rights to inherit is virtually certain. If the distribution takes place at the 'first' moment, there will be no others and only those present at that moment could partake in the distribution. Priority of rights therefore seems directly linked to degree of participation in the funeral. Even if, it is important to note, one might argue that 'the recitation of the Tridaṇḍaka' and 'the worship of the caitya' referred to here need not necessarily refer to moments in the funeral — both activities, after all, as we shall see below, occur in other contexts as well — still the principle holds: preference and priority are still given to those "who, when the gong for the dead is being beaten, come", and there can be no doubt about whether this refers to participation in the funeral. It is also worth noting that the fact that the funeral commences with the sounding of the gong significantly underlines its communal character — this means of summons is only used for activities which concern the entire community: it is used "pour la convocation des moines, . . . l'appel au travail, . . . pour le repas", and "pour annoncer un danger".[27] It is perhaps unnecessary to point out that by making physical presence at key moments of the funeral the determining factor in defining who had first rights to participate as a recipient in the distribution of the estate the compilers of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* assured or reinforced the communal character of the proceedings.

The linkage between the distribution of a deceased monk's property and the performance of his funeral is in fact a central theme of one of the two promulgations of rules governing monastic funerals found in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* that we will look at here. This promulgation is the least known and consists of three interlocked texts which mark out individually what appear to have been considered the important elements of a monastic funeral. They are now found together, one after the other in the *Cīvara-vastu*. The edition of these texts published by N. Dutt is not always satisfactory so, although I cite his edition here, I have inserted into it in brackets at least the more important "corrections" which a study of the manuscript itself has indicated are required. I have also occasionally likewise inserted the "corresponding" Tibetan in parentheses.

I. *śrāvastyāṃ nidānam. tena khalu samayenânyatamo bhikṣur glāno layane kālagataḥ. amanuṣyakeṣūpapannaḥ. cīvarabhājako bhikṣus taṃ layanaṃ praveṣṭum ārabdhaḥ.*

pātracīvaraṃ bhājayāmîti. sa tīvreṇa paryavasthānena laguḍam ādāyôtthitaḥ kathayati: yāvan māṃ abhinirharatha [but ms: *mamâbhinirharatha] tāvat pātracīvaraṃ bhājayatheti (re zhig kho bo dur khrod du yang ma phyung bar lhung bzed dang gos 'ged par byed dam). sa saṃtrasto niṣpalāyitaḥ.*

etat prakaraṇaṃ bhikṣavo bhagavata ārocayanti.

bhagavān āha: pūrvaṃ tāvan mṛto bhikṣur abhinirhartavyaḥ; paścāt tasya pātracīvaraṃ bhājayitavyam iti.[28]

Although the sense of this text — and the two following — is generally clear, it is still not always easy to arrive at an altogether smooth or satisfying translation. This is in large part due to the language of the greater part of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, to what Lévi calls "ses étrangetés", and to its "almost colloquial style".[29] There is, for example, a heavy reliance on pronouns, and sometimes the same pronominal form is used in close proximity with two entirely different referents. This, together with an even more general tendency towards elliptical expression sometimes requires that a good deal of padding be added to any translation. The Tibetan translators too have sometimes been forced in this direction. Moreover, each of the texts in this series employs a *yāvat . . . tāvat* construction, the exact sense of which is neither easy to determine nor easy to render into English, and there is some disquieting variation. The Tibetan translations — though sufficiently clear — seem to presuppose a slightly different text as well. Either that, or they have settled for a far looser translation than usual. With these provisos, the first text may be translated:

I. The setting was in Śrāvastī. On this occasion a certain monk, being sick, died in his cell. He was reborn among the non-human beings. The monk who was the distributor-of-robes started to enter the cell (of the dead monk) saying "I distribute the bowl and robes". (But) he (— the deceased monk —) appeared there with intense anger wielding a club and said: "When you perform for me the removal of the body, (only) then do you effect a distribution of (my) bowl and robe" (Tibetan: "How could one who had not even carried me out to the cremation ground effect a distribution of (my) robe and bowl?")[30] He (— the distributor-of-robes —) was terrified and forced to flee.

The monks ask the Blessed One concerning this matter.

The Blessed One said: "Now first the removal of a dead monk is to be performed. Then his robe and bowl are to be distributed.

Here we have legislated what appears to be the minimum funereal procedure that must be effected before any distribution of a dead monk's property can take place. This procedure is here expressed by

forms of the verb *abhi-nir-√hṛ*. This verb, or close variants of it with or without the initial *abhi-*, is in fact something of a technical expression for the initial act of funereal procedures described in a variety of Buddhist sources.[31] It also occurs in Jain texts dealing with funerals.[32] But even when this exact expression is not used, we find a whole series of parallel expressions — *ādahanaṃ nītvā, śmaśānaṃ nītvā, tam ādāya dahanaṃ gatāḥ, ro bskyal nas*, etc.[33] — which indicate that the removal of the body, undoubtedly ritualized, was a first and minimal procedure involved in carrying out a monastic funeral or a funeral of any kind. It would appear, however, that the compilers of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* did not consider this minimum procedure to be necessarily sufficient. After the passage cited above the second in the series immediately follows:

II. *śrāvastyāṃ nidānam. tena khalu samayenânyatamo bhikṣuḥ kālagataḥ. bhikṣavas tam abhinirhṛtya evam eva śmaśāne chorayitvā vihāram āgataḥ. cīvara-bhājakas tasya layanaṃ praviṣṭaḥ pātracīvaraṃ bhājayāmîti. so 'manuṣyakeṣûpapannaḥ; laguḍam ādāyotthitaḥ sa kathayati: yāvan mama śarīrapūjāṃ-kurutha tāvat pātracīvaraṃ bhājayatheti (re zhig kho bo'i ro la mchod pa yang ma byas par chos gos dang lhung bzed 'ged par byed dam zhes).*
etat prakaraṇaṃ bhikṣavo bhagavata ārocayanti.
bhagavān āha: bhikṣubhis tasya pūrvaṃ śarīrapūjā kartavyeti. tataḥ paścāt pātracīvaraṃ bhājayitavyam. eṣa ādīnavo [na] bhaviṣyatîti (nges dmigs 'dir mi 'gyur ro, supporting Dutt's *[na])*[34]

II. The setting was in Śrāvastī. On that occasion a certain monk died. The monks, having performed the removal of that one('s body), having simply thrown it into the burning ground, returned to the vihāra. The distributor-of-robes entered his (— the dead monk's —) cell saying "I distribute the bowl and robe". He (— the dead monk —) was reborn among the non-human beings. Wielding a club he appeared (in his cell) and said: "When you perform the worship of the body for me, (only) then do you distribute (my) bowl and robe" (Tibetan: "How could one who had not even performed the worshipping of my body effect a distribution of (my) robe and bowl?")
The monks asked the Blessed One concerning this matter.
The Blessed One said: "By the monks the worship of the body for him (— the deceased monk —) is first to be performed. After that (his) bowl and robe are to be distributed. This will (otherwise) be a danger (Tibetan: There would not be in this case a calamity/fault)".

This second text, while indicating that the first procedure was still required, indicates as well that it might not prove sufficient, and provides separate legislation for what appears to have been considered a second necessary component of a *Mūlasarvāstivādin* monastic

funeral. This procedure is called here — and in a considerable number of other places — *śarīra-pūjā*. And this is a term which, although widely cited, has generally not been carefully studied and has, perhaps, been very badly misunderstood. It has very commonly been taken to refer to the worship of relics, but I have recently tried to demonstrate "that *śarīra-pūjā* — whatever it involved — took place after the body had been removed and taken to the cremation ground, but before it was cremated, before there could have been anything like what we call relics", and that it is "fairly certain that *śarīra-pūjā* involved the ritual handling or treatment of the body prior to cremation . . ."[35] Not surprisingly this second text played a part in that attempted demonstration: it, perhaps better than any other passage, points towards what *śarīra-pūjā* involved by clearly stating what its opposite was. *Śarīra-pūjā* is presented in our passage as the opposite of, and correct alternative for, 'having simply thrown the body into the burning ground', or unceremoniously dumping it. That this alternative involved what we understand by the term "worship" seems unlikely, and from this point of view at least "worship of the body" is undoubtedly not a very good translation of *śarīra-pūjā*. I have retained it only to maintain some consistency with the way in which the term *pūjā* is generally rendered.[36] The Pāli sources here offer little aid. In fact the term *śarīra-pūjā*, although found throughout Mūlasarvāstivāda literature, is curiously uncommon in Pāli canonical literature outside of the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* where it is not impossible that it — like several other lexical items there — may represent a borrowing from continental Sanskrit sources.[37] Although it also is not common, a Pāli parallel expression may be had in the term *sarīra-kicca*, but it too lacks a precise definition, being defined only as "the duties of the body, i.e. funeral rites".[38]

We have, then, in these two texts the legislation of two distinct funereal procedures which appear to have been considered necessary to keep angry ghosts at bay and allow the distribution of a dead monk's property to go forward unobstructed. These same two procedures, however, are by no means exclusive to a dead monk's funeral. They are also components of, for example, the funerals of the Kings Aśoka (. . . *śibikābhir nirharitvā śarīrapūjāṃ kṛtvā*) and Prasenajit (. . . *dur khrod du skyol cig . . . 'di'i khog pa la mchod pa lhag par bya*

ba),[39] and therefore do not specifically define a monastic funeral. Something more would appear to be required, and this is precisely what we find in the third and final text of this series:

III. *śrāvastyāṃ nidānam. tena khalu samayenânyatamo bhikṣur glāno layane kālagataḥ. sa bhikṣur ādahanaṃ nītvā śarīrapūjāṃ kṛtvā dagdhaḥ. tato vihāram āgataḥ [*but ms: *āgatā]. cīvarabhājakas tasya layanaṃ praviṣṭaḥ. sa laguḍam ādāyotthitaḥ, tat tāvan [* but ms. clearly *na tāvan*, in this instance agreeing with Tibetan*] māṃ uddiśya dharmaśravaṇam anuprayacchatha tāvac cīvarakāṇi bhājayatheti (re zhig bdag gi ched du chos bsgrags pa ma byas par chos gos rnams 'ged par byed dam).*
etat prakaraṇaṃ bhikṣavo bhagavata ārocayanti.
bhagavān āha: tam uddiśya dharmaśravaṇaṃ dattvā dakṣiṇāṃ uddiśya paścāc cīvarakāṇi bhājayitavyānîti (de'i ched du chos bsgrags pa dang / de'i ched du yon bsngo ba byas nas chos gos rnams bgo bar bya'o).[40]

III. The setting was in Śrāvastī. On that occasion a certain monk, being sick, died in his cell. After having brought him to the burning ground, (and) having performed (for him) the worship of the body, that (deceased) monk was cremated. After that they (— the monks who had performed these procedures —) returned to the vihāra. The distributor-of-robes entered that (dead monk's) cell. He (— the dead monk —) appeared wielding a club, saying "you do not yet give a recitation of the Dharma for my sake, (but only) then are you to effect a distribution of my monastic robes" (Tibetan: "How could one who had not performed a recitation of Dharma for me effect a distribution of (my) robes?").
The monks ask the Blessed One concerning this matter.
The Blessed One said: "Having given a recitation of Dharma in his (— the deceased's —) name, having directed the reward (to him), after that his monastic robes are to be distributed".

In this third and final text of the series the monks, although they have performed the removal of the body, and although they have performed as well the worship of the body, are still confronted by the belligerent ghost. He still has not relinquished ownership rights to his property. For that to happen one further — and by implication final — procedure appears to be required. This procedure is the most distinctively Buddhist of those so far met and appears to be particularly — perhaps exclusively — associated with monastic funerals. Although, as we have seen, both the 'removal' and 'the worship of the body' occur in the descriptions of the funerals of the Kings Prasenajit and Aśoka, there is no reference in either account to a 'recitation of Dharma' having been made for their sake or a transfer of the resulting merit to their account. This stands in clear contrast with what we often find in the accounts of funerals performed for monks or nuns. In the latter

accounts there is not infrequently reference either to a recitation of Dharma, or to the transfer of merit, or both.[41] The recitation and transfer of merit are the last and apparently sufficient elements of a monastic funeral that are separately legislated here. They appear to achieve the definitive separation of the deceased monk from his property and allow the distribution of that property to go forward unencumbered. It is important to note that the monks who participate in the funeral generate the merit by giving a recitation of the Dharma, and it is the monks who assign the merit to the deceased. This appears to be a straightforward case of religious merit being transferred or assigned to one that did not produce it.[42] This straightforward transfer of merit is in fact characteristic of many parts of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, and this *Vinaya* contains as well numerous indications of its compilers' concerns with making such transfers to several categories of the dead.[43] There is, however, more here.

It is, of course, not simply the merit itself which allows the distribution of a dead monk's property to go forward. It is perhaps more the proper and complete performance of his funeral by the monks in attendance. The distribution, therefore, would appear to turn on two points: one, before the property is unencumbered, before any distribution can take place, a set of ritual procedures must be performed or a set of ritual obligations owed to the deceased must be met; two, those who participate in these rituals or in meeting these obligations are — as the account of Upananda's estate makes clear — precisely the same individuals who have a first and prior claim on the estate ("who, when the gong for the dead is being beaten, comes — to him something is to be given"; etc.). It is, moreover, almost certainly not accidental that the monks who perform or participate in the dead monk's funeral are the monks who have the first rights and opportunities to receive or 'inherit' the deceased's property. In fact such an arrangement would appear to suggest that — at least — these Buddhist monastic regulations governing the distribution of a dead monk's property were framed to conform to, or be in harmony with, classical Hindu laws or Dharmaśāstric conventions governing inheritance. In his *History of Dharmaśāstra* Kane says, for example, that "there was a close connection between taking the estate of a man and performing the rites after death up to the 10th day", and "that it was obligatory on everyone

who took the estate of another . . . to arrange for the rites after death and śrāddha".[44] The *Baudhāyana-Pitṛmedha-sūtra* says that "proper cremation-rites" should be performed not only for one's mother, father, preceptor, etc., but also for any "person who leaves inheritance for one whether he belongs to one's gotra or not".[45] This congruency between Buddhist monastic rule and "Hindu Law" is not only interesting,[46] it is also in striking contrast with the apparent lack of congruency between the same *Vinaya* rule and formal Buddhist doctrine.

There can be little question that the promulgation of this set of rules is based on a belief in an individual "personality" that survives after death. That "personality", moreover, was thought to retain an active interest in, and ownership rights to, his former possessions. The claims of that "person" had to be compensated before any distribution of those possessions could take place. This belief — it is important to keep in mind — was assumed and articulated by monks in a code of behavior meant to govern monks. It is not part of some ill-defined "lay" or "popular" Buddhism. It is an element of official monastic Buddhism, and precisely for that reason its seemingly total lack of congruency with the supposedly fundamental Buddhist doctrine of the absence of a permanent self is even more striking. In speaking of the "traditional Buddhism" of the rural highlands of modern Sri Lanka, Richard Gombrich has said that

> though the doctrine of *anatta* can be salvaged by the claim that the personality continuing through a series of births has as much reality as the personality within one life, *prārthanā* for happy rebirths and the transfer of merit to dead relatives show that the *anatta* doctrine has no more affective immediacy with regard to the next life than with regard to this, and that belief in personal survival after death is a fundamental feature of Sinhalese Buddhism in practice.[47]

The set of rules governing monastic funerals and inheritance that we have been looking at suggests the very real possibility that there is nothing new in the modern Sri Lankan case. It suggests as well the distinct possibility that purportedly "fundamental" Buddhist doctrine may not only have had little influence on lay Buddhist behavior, it may as well have had equally little influence on even highly "educated" literate monks.[48] The implications of this possibility are, of course, far reaching, and there are some equally interesting implications for our understanding of monastic Buddhism in a second promulgation of rules

concerning monastic funerals which occurs in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya.*

Unlike the set of rules for monastic funerals that occur in the *Cīvara-vastu*, the second promulgation, perhaps because it is preserved as well in Chinese, has been referred to several times in the scholarly literature. In fact, apart from short or incidental references we also have several paraphrases or summaries of the text — the earliest, perhaps, by Rockhill, based on the Tibetan;[49] the fullest, based on the Chinese, by de la Vallée Poussin;[50] and the most recent, again based on the Chinese, by Anna Seidel.[51] None of these paraphrases or summaries is, however, entirely satisfactory from at least one point of view. This text — which is preserved in Tibetan in the *Vinaya-kṣudraka-vastu* — does not link the proper performance of a monastic funeral with the distribution of a deceased monk's property as do the texts preserved in the *Cīvara-vastu.* The text in the *Kṣudraka-vastu* is, rather, preoccupied with yet another problem which the death of a local monk would have raised for a Buddhist community. Unlike the *Cīvara-vastu* texts which appear to respond to the kind of problems which such a death would occasion within the group — to what might be called internal problems — the text in the *Kṣudraka-vastu* appears to have been intended to respond to the kind of problems that such a death could occasion between that group and the larger world that surrounded it and on which it was almost entirely dependent. These external problems are most fully articulated not so much in the rules themselves but in the frame-story which accounts for their promulgation, and it is this frame-story which has suffered the most in the paraphrases. As a consequence there are good reasons for citing here the Tibetan text as a whole. The text I cite is based on the three Kanjurs available to me: the Derge, Peking, and Tog Palace.[52]

sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das mnyan yod na rgyal bu rgyal byed kyi tshal mgon med zas sbyin gyi kun dga' ra ba na[1] *bzhugs so /*

mnyan yod na khyim bdag cig[2] *gnas pa des rigs mnyam pa las chung ma blangs te / de de dang lhan cig ces bya ba nas / bu pho zhig* [3]*btsas te de*[3] *btsas*[4] *pa'i btsas ston zhag bdun gsum nyi shu gcig tu rgya cher byas nas rigs dang mthun*[5] *pa'i ming btags te bsrings bskyed*[6] *nas chen por gyur to zhes bya ba'i bar snga ma bzhin no /*

ji tsam dus gzhan zhig na legs par gsungs pa'i chos 'dul ba la rab tu byung ba dang / de'i khams ma[7] *mnyam nas na bar gyur te / de rtsa ba dang / sdong bu dang / me tog dang / 'bras bu'i sman dag gis rim gro byas na ma phan te dus las 'das so /*

de dge slong dag gis lhung bzed dang bcas / chos gos dang bcas par[8] *lam dang nye ba zhig tu bor ro /*

ji tsam na lam de nas bram ze dang khyim bdag 'gro ba de[9] *dag gis de mthong ste / de ni*[10] *kha cig gis smras pa / shes*[11] *ldan dag śākya'i bu*[12] *zhig dus las 'das so / gzhan dag gis smras pa /tshur sheg*[13] *blta bar bya'o /* [14]*de dag gis mthong nas ngo shes te de dag gis smras pa / shes ldan dag 'di ni khyim bdag che ge mo'i bu yin te / dge sbyong śākya'i bu pa mgon med pa rnams kyi nang du rab tu byung bas gnas skabs 'di 'dra bar gyur to / 'di dag gi nang du rab tu byung bar ma gyur na de*[15] *nye du dag gis 'di rim gro byas par 'gyur ba zhig /*

skabs de bcom ldan 'das la dge slong dag gis gsol ba dang / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / dge slong dag de lta bas na gnang gis dge slong shi ba'i rim gro bya'o / bcom ldan 'das kyis dge slong shi ba'i rim gro bya'o zhes gsungs[16] *pa dang / dge slong dag ji ltar rim gro bya ba mi shes nas / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / bsreg*[17] *bar bya'o /*

bcom ldan 'das kyis bsreg par bya'o zhes gsungs pa dang / bcom ldan 'das la tshe dang ldan pa nye ba 'khor gyis zhus pa / btsun pa bcom ldan 'das kyis lus 'di la srin bu'i rigs brgyad khri yod do zhes gang gsungs pa de dag ji lta bu lags / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / nye ba[18] *'khor de skyes*[19] *ma thag tu de dag kyang skye la / shi ba'i tshe de dag kyang 'chi mod kyi 'on kyang rma'i sgo rnams su brtags te bsreg par bya'o /*

bcom ldan 'das kyis bsreg par bya'o zhes gsungs ba dang / shing ma 'byor nas skabs de bcom ldan 'das la dge slong dag gis gsol ba dang / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / chu klung dag tu dor bar bya'o / chu klung med nas bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / sa brkos te gzhug par bya'o / dbyar kha sa yang 'thas la shing yang srog chags can du gyur nas / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / thibs po'i phyogs su mgo byang phyogs su bstan te sngas su rtsva'i[21] *bam po bzhag la glo g-yas pas bsnyal te rtsva*[22] *'am lo ma'i tshogs kyis*[23] *g-yogs la yon bsngo zhing rgyun*[24] *chags gsum gyi chos mnyan pa byin nas 'dong bar bya'o /*

dge slong dag de bzhin du dong ba dang / bram ze dang khyim bdag dag śākya'i bu'i dge sbyong rnams ni ro bskyal nas khrus mi byed par de bzhin 'dong ste gtsang sbra med do / zhes 'phya bar byed nas / skabs de bcom ldan 'das la dge slong dag gis gsol ba dang / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / de bzhin du 'dong bar mi bya'i 'on kyang khrus bya'o / de dag thams cad bkru bar brtsams pa dang / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / thams cad krus mi bya'i gang dag reg pa de dag gis gos dang bcas te bkru bar bya'o / gzhan dag gis ni rkang lag nyi tshe bkru bar bya'o /

de dag mchod rten la phyag mi 'tshal nas / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa /mchod rten[25] *la phyag 'tshal bar bya'o*

NOTES

[1] P omits *na.* [2] P *gcig.* [3] P omits *btsas te de.* [4] P *bcas.* [5] P *'thun.* [6] P *bskyad.*
[7] T *mi.* [8] P *bad.* [9] P *da.* [10] T *na.* [11] P *shas.* [12] T adds *pa* after *bu.* [13] T *shog.*
[14] T has an additional *de* before *de dag gis.* [15] T omits *de.* [16] P *gsangs.* [17] P *bsregs.*
[18] P, T *bar*; the name is commonly spelled *nye bar 'khor.* [19] T *skyed.*
[20] P *gsung.* [21] P *rtsa'i.* [22] P *rca.* [23] P *kyas.* [24] P, T *rgyud.* [25] P, T both add *dag* after *rten.*

The Buddha, the Blessed One, dwelt in Śrāvastī, in Prince Jeta's grove, in the park of Anāthapiṇḍada.

In Śrāvastī there was a certain householder. He took a wife from a family of equal standing and, having laid with her, a son was born. Having performed in detail for three times seven, or twenty-one, days the birth ceremonies for the new born son, he was given a name corresponding to his gotra (*trīṇi saptakāni ekaviṃśatidivasāni vistareṇa jātasya jātimahaṃ kṛtvā; gotrānurūpaṃ nāmadheyaṃ vyavasthāpitaṃ*).[53] His upbringing, to his maturity, was as before.[54]

When, at another time, he (— the householder's son —)[55] had entered (the Order of this) well-spoken Dharma and Vinaya, his bodily humors having become unbalanced, he fell ill. Though he was attended with medicines made from roots and stalks and flowers and fruits, it was of no use and he died (*sa . . . mūlagaṇḍapatra-puṣpaphalabhaiṣajyair upasthīyamāno na svasthībhavati . . . sa ca kālagataḥ*).[56]

The monks left him (i.e. his body), together with his robe and bowl, near a road.

Later, Brahmins and householders who were out walking saw him from the road. One said, referring to him: "Good Sirs, a Buddhist monk (*śākyaputra*) has died". Others said: "Come here! look at this!" When they looked they recognized the dead monk and said: "Good Sirs, this is the son of such and such a householder. This is the sort of thing that happens when someone joins the order of those lordless Buddhist śramaṇas. Had he not joined their order his kinsmen would have performed the funeral ceremonies for him".[57]

The monks reported this matter to the Blessed One, and the Blessed One said: "Now then, monks, with my authorization, funeral ceremonies for a (deceased) monk are to be performed" ("Bhikṣus, il faut rendre les derniers devoirs au cadavre").[58] Although it was said by the Blessed One "funeral ceremonies for a deceased monk are to be performed", because the monks did not know how they should be performed, the Blessed One said: "(A deceased monk) is to be cremated".

Although the Blessed One said: "(A deceased monk) should be cremated", the Venerable Upāli asked the Blessed One: "Is that which was said by the Reverend Blessed One — that there are 80,000 kinds of worms in the human body — not so?" The Blessed One said: "Upāli, as soon as a man is born, those worms are also born, so, at the moment of death, they too surely die. Still, (only) after examining the opening of any wound, is the body to be cremated" ("Quand le corps présente des ulcères, on doit voir s'il n'y a pas d'animaux, et alors le brûler". "Si le cadavre a des plaies, on ne peut le brûler qu'après avoir vérifié s'il n'y a pas de vers").[59]

Although the Blessed One said (a deceased monk) is to be cremated, when wood was not at hand the monks asked the Blessed One concerning this matter, and the Blessed One said: "The body is to be thrown into rivers". When there is no river, the Blessed One said: "Having dug a grave, it is to be buried". When it is summer and both the earth is hard and the wood is full of living things ("En été, la terre est humide et fourmille d'animaux"; "[et] en été, [quand] la terre est humide et fourmille de vers et d'insects?"),[60] the Blessed One said: "In an isolated spot, with its head pointing North, having put down a bundle of grass as a bolster, having laid the corpse on its right side, having covered it with bunches of grass or leaves, having directed the reward (to the deceased),[61] and having given a recitation of the Dharma of the *Tridaṇḍaka*, the monks are to disperse".[62]

The monks dispersed accordingly. But then Brahmins and householders derided

them saying: "Buddhist śramaṇas, after carrying away a corpse, do not bathe and yet disperse like that. They are polluted." The monks asked the Blessed One concerning this matter, and the Blessed One said: "Monks should not disperse in that manner, but should bathe". They all started to bathe, but the Blessed One said: "Everyone need not bathe. Those who came in contact (with the corpse) must wash themselves together with their robes. Others need only wash their hands and feet".

When the monks did not worship the stūpa, the Blessed One said: "The stūpa (v.l. stūpas) is to be worshipped" ("Rentrés au couvent, ils ne vénéraient pas le *caitya*. Le Bouddha dit: 'Il faut vénérer le *caitya*' ").[63]

Anyone who has read even a little *Vinaya* will immediately recognize this promulgation of rules as yet another instance — though perhaps a particularly striking one — of the preoccupation of the compilers of these codes with avoiding social censure. This preoccupation — which not infrequently appears obsessive — has been described in a number of ways. I. B. Horner has said, for example, in referring to the Pāli *Vinaya*:

For the believing laity, though naturally not to the forefront in the Vinaya, are in a remarkable way never absent, never far distant . . . thus the Vinaya does not merely lay down sets of rules whose province was confined to an internal conventual life. For this was led in such a way as to allow and even to encourage a certain degree of intercommunication with the lay supporters and followers, no less than with those lay-people who were not adherents of the faith. What was important, was that the monks should neither abuse their dependence on the former, nor alienate the latter, but should so regulate their lives as to give no cause for complaint. With these aims in view, conduct that was not thought seemly for them to indulge in had to be carefully defined; and it became drafted in rule and percept.[64]

Elsewhere Horner again says: "It must be remembered that it was considered highly important to propitiate these [lay followers], to court their admiration, to keep their allegiance, to do nothing to annoy them".[65] But she also raises another point which may be germane to our *Kṣudraka-vastu* passage and — when seen in a certain light — only underscores the curious absence of such a passage in the Pāli *Vinaya*. She says: "We cannot tell with any degree of accuracy the historical order in which the rules [in the *Vinaya*] were formulated", but she notes too that "it is, however, more likely that the majority of the rules grew up gradually, as need arose, and are the outcome of historical developments that went on within the Order".[66]

Miss Horner's observations concerning the monastic sensitivity to lay values are important for a full understanding of our passage

because there can hardly be a doubt that this passage — and the rules promulgated there — concern two related topics on which any even partially brahmanized social groups would have been acutely sensitive: death and pollution. Professor Malamoud has not only said that "le rituel funéraire est le *saṃskāra* par excellence", but has noted as well that "les injonctions, les instructions techniques et les justifications théologiques qui traitent de la manière dont les vivants doivent se comporter à l'égard des morts forment une part considérable de la littérature normative de l'Inde brâhmanique (hymnes védiques, Brāhmaṇa, Kalpasūtra, Dharmasūtra et Dharmaśāstra). Le rituel funéraire . . . frappe par sa richesse, sa complexité, sa cohérence". "Le service des morts," he says, "l'institution des morts pèsent d'un poids très lourd dans la vie des Indiens qui se rattachent en quelque manière au brâhmanisme".[67] Much the same, of course, has been said of 'purity' and 'pollution'. "Normative literature", says Dumont, "the literature of the *dharma* or religious law, has purification (*śuddhi*) as one of its main themes, the impurity resulting from birth and death being specially designated *āśauca* . . . Family impurity is the most important: it is that of birth (*sūtaka*) and above all death".[68]

As the sources cited especially by Malamoud would indicate, the brahmanical preoccupation with the proper ritual treatment of the dead was not only broad but very old. It would presumably have informed and presumably have framed the attitudes of any brahmanical or brahmanized community that Buddhist monastic groups came into contact with, and such contact must have been early and frequent at least in the middle Gangetic plains — the area including Śrāvastī, Kauśāmbī, Rājagṛha, Vaiśali, etc. Any disregard of such set attitudes in the surrounding population, especially of those touching on the treatment of the dead and pollution, would have opened the Buddhist monastic community to immediate criticism and opprobrium. Such criticism would have been especially strong if the case involved a deceased individual who had originally been a member of the local group, an individual whose history and birth were widely known. The compiler of our *Kṣudraka-vastu* passage seems, in fact, to have encountered or envisioned just such a situation. He seems to have taken some pains to clearly indicate that the deceased monk had been born from a perfectly regular, normatively sanctioned marriage; that

the full complement of normative birth rituals had been performed for him; that he had been named according to his *gotra*. The proper performance of ritual that accompanied his birth, however, only provides a stronger contrast for the initial total disregard of normative procedures in regard to his death on the part of the Buddhist monastic community. The response such disregard is said to have provoked seems entirely believable — even the language seems particularly appropriate here: "Come here! Look at this! . . . This is the sort of thing that happens when someone joins the order of those lordless Buddhist śramaṇas". Such behavior would most certainly have 'alienated' "those lay-people who were not adherents of the faith", and almost certainly would not have been long tolerated by either that group or — importantly — the Buddhist community that had to interact with and depend on it. In fact, unless the extent and depth of brahmanical attitudes among actual communities have been badly overestimated — and this is not impossible — it is almost inconceivable that such blatant disregard of established custom and local feeling would not have been immediately checked and regulated "in rule and precept". But this would in turn suggest that such rules, regardless of where they now occur, would probably have been in place very early on, and would suggest that a *Vinaya* which — like the Pāli *Vinaya* — did not contain such rules would have been poorly equipped to deal with monastic communities in close contact with brahmanical societies. The first of these suggestions has historical implications: it may be that this set of rules — like much else in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* — is very old indeed;[69] the second may underscore the importance of geography for understanding the various monastic codes: a monastic code framed in a predominantly brahmanical area would almost certainly — regardless of chronological considerations — contain rules and sets of rules which may differ from or not be included in codes that were redacted in, or meant for, communities in, say, predominantly "tribal" areas. Local or regional standards may have determined a good deal.

But if this second promulgation of rules concerning the local monastic dead in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* was, unlike the first, intended to respond to a particularly sensitive concern of the larger social group with which Buddhist monastic communities had to

interact, and from which they drew recruits and economic support, still the funereal procedures which it prescribed were essentially similar to those of the first promulgation. Formal removal of the body — *abhinirhāra* — though not explicitly mentioned in the rules, is taken for granted throughout: the body is not to be casually dumped by the road side; there is clear reference to the monks having carried away the corpse (*śākya'i bu'i dge sbyong rnams ni ro bskyal nas*) in the remarks of the brahmins and householders concerning monks not having washed. Although the term *śarīra-pūjā / ro la mchod pa* is not explicitly used, *rim gro bya ba* — which generally translates some form of *sat√kṛ* — is contextually clearly its equivalent here: whereas in *Cīvara-vastu* II *śarīra-pūjā* is the prescribed alternative to simply dumping the body in the burning ground, *satkāra* here is the prescribed alternative to throwing it unceremoniously alongside the road.[70] The *Kṣudraka-vastu* passage differs, to be sure, in stipulating certain contingencies when alternative means of disposal could be used, but in doing so it only emphasizes the fact that the first choice in normal circumstances was cremation. The two related elements in the *Cīvara-vastu* monastic funeral which appear to be both most peculiarly Buddhist and, perhaps, restricted to funerals for monks — the recitation of Dharma and the transfer of merit — are also both explicitly mentioned and taken for granted. Although only actually mentioned after the last of the series of alternative means of disposal, it seems fairly certain that it was to be understood that both the recitation and the transfer of merit were to follow whichever alternative was undertaken.[71]

We have, then, in these passages from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* that we have looked quickly at two sets of similar and mutually supplementive rules meant to govern a monastic funeral. They establish — contrary to the old and established conventional wisdom — that Buddhist *Vinaya* texts are by no means "nearly altogether silent as to the last honours of deceased monks", and they point to yet another concern in regard to which the Pāli *Vinaya* as we have it appears to be markedly deficient and possibly unrepresentative. They also — together with various narrative accounts scattered throughout *Mūlasarvāstivādin* literature — allow us to reconstruct the complete outline of a *Mūlasarvāstivādin* monastic funeral, from the tolling of the

bell to the post-funeral bath, and they indicate that the laity was allowed no place in these procedures, that the funeral of a local monk was an exclusively monastic affair, participation being limited to monks and monks alone.[72] Even more than this, they allow us entrée into the 'mentality' and concerns of the *Vinaya* masters that framed this code. They allow us to see learned monks and *Vinaya* authorities framing rules which were intended to avoid ghosts[73] and occupied with the problems of inheritance and estates; monks concerned with carefully regulating behavior to avoid social censure, and monks — perhaps most importantly — that appear to have been influenced and motivated as much by Indian mores, beliefs, and 'legal' conventions, as by specifically Buddhist doctrines. They allow us to see, in short, a Buddhist monk who is far more human, and far more Indian, than the monk we usually meet in the works of Western scholarship.[74]

TEXTUAL SOURCES CITED & ABBREVIATIONS

ACF = *Annuaire du collège de france*
Aṅguttara = R. Morris & E. Hardy, eds., *The Aṅguttara-Nikāya*, Vols. 1—5 (London: 1885—1900) — cited by volume number & page.
Avadānaśataka = J. S. Speyer, ed., *Avadānaçataka. A Century of Edifying Tales belonging to the Hīnayāna* (Bibliotheca Buddhica, III) Vols. 1—2 (St.-Pétersbourg: 1906—9) — cited by volume, page & line.
BEFEO = *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême-orient*
Derge = *The Sde-dge Mtshal-par Bka'-'gyur, A Facsimile Edition of the 18th Century Redaction of Si-Tu Chos-kyi-'byuṅ-gnas Prepared under the Direction of H. H. the 16th Rgyal-dbaṅ Karma-pa*, Vols. 1—103 (Delhi: 1976ff) — cited by volume, 'folio' number in the facsimile (not by original pagination), & line.
Divyāvadāna = P. L. Vaidya, ed., *Divyāvadāna* (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, 20) (Darbhanga: 1959) — by page & line.
Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts = R. Vira & L. Chandra, eds., *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*, Part 6 (Śata-Piṭaka Series 10 (6)) (New Delhi: 1974) — by volume number, 'folio' number assigned in the facsimile, & line.
Gilgit Manuscripts = N. Dutt, ed., *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. III, Part 1 (Srinagar: 1947); Vol. III, Part 2 (Srinagar: 1942); Vol. III, Part 3 (Srinagar: 1943); Vol. III, Part 4 (Calcutta: 1950) — cited by volume, part, page & line.
HJAS = *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*
IBK = *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū*
IHQ = *Indian Historical Quarterly*
JA = *Journal asiatique*
JAOS = *Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JIABS = *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*

JOIB = *Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda*

Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra = *E. Waldschmidt, ed., Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra. Text in Sanskrit und Tibetisch, verglichen mit dem Pāli nebst einer Übersetzung der chinesischen Entsprechung im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*, Teil I (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Jahrgang 1949 nr. 1) (Berlin: 1950); Teil II (Abhandlungen . . . zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1950 nr. 2) (Berlin: 1951); Teil III (Abhandlungen . . . und Kunst, Jahrgang 1950 nr. 3) (Berlin: 1951) — cited according to the "Vorgänge" and section numbers imposed on his restored text by Waldschmidt.

Pāli Vinaya = H. Oldenberg, *The Vinaya Piṭakaṃ. One of the Principal Buddhist Holy Scriptures in the Pāli Language*, Vols. 1—5 (London: 1879—1885) — cited by volume, page & line.

Peking = D. T. Suzuki, ed., *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition, Reprinted under the Supervision of the Otani University, Kyoto*, Vols. 1—169 (Tokyo/Kyoto: 1955—61) — cited by volume, page, 'folio' & line.

Pravrajyā-vastu = C. Vogel & K. Wille, eds., *Some Hitherto Unidentified Fragments of the Pravrajyāvastu Portion of the Vinayavastu Manuscript found near Gilgit* (Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen I. Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1984, nr. 7) (Göttingen: 1984) — cited by page or folio number & line.

Rab tu 'byuṅ ba'i gẑi = H. Eimer, ed., *Rab tu 'byuṅ ba'i gẑi. Die tibetische Übersetzung des Pravrajyāvastu im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*, Teil 1—2 (Asiatische Forschungen, Bd. 82) (Wiesbaden: 1983) — cited by volume, page & line.

Saṅghabheda-vastu = R. Gnoli, ed., *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu. Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*, Parts I—II (Serie Orientale Roma, XLIX, 1—2) (Roma: 1977—78) — cited by volume, page & line.

Śayanāsana & Adhikaraṇa-vastus = R. Gnoli, ed., *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Śayanāsanavastu and the Adhikaraṇavastu. Being the 15th and 16th Sections of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin* (Serie Orientale Roma, L) (Roma: 1978) — cited by page & line.

Tog = *The Tog Palace Manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur*, Vols. 1—109 (Leh: 1975—80) — cited by volume, 'folio' number assigned in the reprint (not by original pagination) & line.

TP = *T'oung Pao*

Udāna = P. Steinthal, *Udāna* (London: 1885) — cited by page & line.

NOTES

[1] H. Oldenberg, *Buddha. Sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde* (Berlin: 1881) 384 n; H. Oldenberg, *Buddha. His Life, His Doctrine, His Order*, trans. W. Hoey (London: 1882) 376 n.

[2] T. W. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist Suttas* (Sacred Books of the East, XI) (Oxford: 1900) xliv—xlv. — In light of the references by both Oldenberg and Rhys Davids to the Vinaya, it is worth noting that there is good evidence for suggesting that the

Mahāparinibbāna-sutta — which contains, of course, elaborate rules for funerals — was originally a part of the Pāli *Vinaya*; see L. Finot, "Textes historiques dans le canon pāli", *JA* (1932) 158; Finot, "Mahāparinibbāna-sutta and Cullavagga", *IHQ* 8 (1932) 241—46; E. Obermiller, "The Account of the Buddha's Nirvāṇa and the First Councils according to the Vinayakṣudraka", *IHQ* 8 (1932) 781—84; E. Frauwallner, *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature* (Serie Orientale Roma 8) (Roma: 1956) 42 ff. There are as well indications that when read as a piece of Vinaya, a number of puzzling elements in the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* begin to make much better sense; see below notes 46 and 72.

[3] For a discussion of the differential treatment of archeological/epigraphical and textual sources see G. Schopen, "Archeology and Protestant Presuppositions in the Study of Indian Buddhism", *History of Religions* 31 (1991) 1—23. One might suspect, moreover, that the inclination to locate Buddhism in canonical texts has had an inhibiting influence even on anthropological investigations. C. F. Keyes, for example, says — quoting Rhys Davids: "Because both men [i.e. two modern Thai "Saints"] were considered to be Buddhist saints, their deaths were interpreted in terms of Buddhist ideas about death and its aftermath. *There is really only one source for these ideas*, particularly since nothing is said in the Vinaya, the discipline incumbent upon monks, about the disposal of the corpses of members of the Sangha (Rhys Davids: xlv); and that is in the account of the death of the Buddha himself as given in the *Mahāparinibbāna sutta*" (C. F. Keyes, "Death of Two Buddhist Saints in Thailand", in *Charisma and Sacred Biography* (*JAAR Thematic Studies* XLVIII/3 and 4) 154; my emphasis). This seeming restriction of "Buddhist ideas" to canonical texts appears especially odd coming from an anthropologist. In fact Keyes himself has done perhaps more than anyone else writing on South East Asia to show that "Buddhist ideas about death" can come from a variety of sources: C. F. Keyes, "Tug-of-war for Merit: Cremation of a Senior Monk", *Journal of the Siam Society* 63.1—2 (1975) 44—62; P. K. Anusaranaśāsanakiarti & C. F. Keyes, "Funerary Rites and the Buddhist Meaning of Death: An Interpretative Text for Northern Thailand", *Journal of the Siam Society* 68.1 (1980) 1—28; cf. S. J. Tambiah, "The Ideology of Merit and the Social Correlates of Buddhism in a Thai Village", in *Dialectic in Practical Religion*, ed. E. R. Leach (Cambridge: 1968) 41—121; esp. 88—99; etc. Significantly, there has been — in so far as I know — no work done on monastic funerals, and little on the disposal of the dead in general, in Sri Lanka, for example, in spite of the fact that we have a reasonably detailed description of a monastic funeral which took place there in the 5th century (Fa-hsien, *A Record of the Buddhist Countries*, trans. Li Yung-hsi (Peking: 1957) 83—84. (For some incidental references to monastic funerals in Tibet and Tibetan speaking areas see T. Wylie, "Mortuary Customs at Sa-Skya, Tibet", *HJAS* 25 (1964—65) 229—42; M. Brauen, "Death Customs in Ladakh", *Kailash* 9 (1982) 319—32; C. Ramble, "Status and Death: Mortuary Rites and Attitudes to the Body in a Tibetan Village", *Kailash* 9 (1982) 333—56; T. Skorupski, "The Cremation Ceremony according to the Byang-gter Tradition", *Kailash* 9 (1982) 361—76; etc.) It is, finally, worth noting that although an immense amount of work has been done on Medieval Christian monasticism relatively little has, again, been done on monastic funerals — see, however, for some interesting comparative and contrastive material, L. Gougaud, "Anciennes coutumes claustrales. La mort du moine", *Revue Mabillon* (1929) 283—302; J. Leclercq, "Documents sur la mort des moines", *Revue Mabillon*

(1955) 165—79; (1956) 65—81; J.-L. Lemaitre, "L'inscription dans les necrologes clunisiens, XI^{e}—XII^{e} siecles", in *La mort au moyen age. Colloque de l'association des historiens médiévistes français réunis à Strasbourg en juin 1975 au palais universitaire* (Strasbourg: 1977) 153—67; J.-L. Lemaitre, "La mort et la commémoration des défunts dans les prieurés", in *Prieurs et prieurés dans l'occident médiéval*, ed. J.-L. Lemaitre (Genève: 1987) 181—190; L. Gougaud, *Dévotions et pratiques ascétiques du moyen age* (Paris: 1925) 129—42 ("Mourir sous le froc"); etc.

[4] For a preliminary survey and discussion of this evidence see G. Schopen, "An Old Inscription from Amarāvatī and the Cult of the Local Monastic Dead in Indian Buddhist Monasteries", *JIABS* 14.2 (1991).

[5] K. R. Norman, "The Value of the Pāli Tradition", '*Jagajjyoti*' *Buddha Jayanti Annual* (Calcutta: 1984) 1—9, esp. 4, 7; cf. K. R. Norman, "Pāli Philology and the Study of Buddhism", *The Buddhist Heritage* (Buddhica Britannica, Series Continua I) (Tring, U.K.: 1989) 29—53; also the much earlier S. Lévi, "Observations sur une langue précanonique du bouddhisme", *JA* (1912) 495—514, esp. 511.

[6] A. Csoma de Körös, "Analysis of the Dulva", *Asiatic Researches* 20 (1836) 41—93, esp. 71, 89; cf. A. Csoma de Körös, *Analyse du Kandjour*, traduite et augmentée par L. Feer (Annales du musée guimet, 2) (Lyon: 1881) 175, 192, 194.

[7] W. W. Rockhill, *The Life of Buddha and the Early History of His Order derived from Tibetan Works in the Bkhah-hgyur and Bstan-hgyur* (London: 1884) 112, 116, 150, etc.

[8] P. V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. IV (Poona: 1953) 234—35. The idea that "the Vinaya" treats "all details of the daily life of the recluses" rather than simply the staggering number of areas in which there were problems is also still with us: "As the *saṅgha* evolved, regulations developed governing the cenobitical life. These ordinances, preserved in the Vinaya Piṭaka of the Pāli Canon, detail every aspect of the lives of monks and runs [read: nuns] in the saṇgha"; K. G. Zysk, *Asceticism and Healing in Ancient India. Medicine in the Buddhist Monastery* (Oxford: 1991) 39. If such characterizations of the scope of "the Vinaya" are accepted, then we are stuck with an interesting irony: ". . . les Vinayapiṭaka . . . ne soufflent mot des nombreuses pratiques spirituelles, méditations, recueillements, etc., qui constituaient l'essence même de la 'religion' bouddhique" (A. Bareau, "La construction et le culte des stūpa d'après les Vinayapiṭaka", *BEFEO* 50 (1960) 249). To say that the *Vinayas* "ne soufflent mot" about such matters is too strong, but the point remains: if we had to judge by the *Vinayas*, we would have to conclude that "pratiques spirituelles" had little, if any, place in the daily life of monks and nuns.

[9] See most recently A. Yuyama, *Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur.* Erster Teil. *Vinaya-Texte*, Hrsg. H. Bechert (Wiesbaden: 1979) 12—33; K. Wille, *Die Handschriftliche Überlieferung des Vinayavastu der Mūla-sarvāstivādin* (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland. Supplementband 30) (Stuttgart: 1990).

[10] Ét. Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien. des origines à l'ère śaka* (Louvain: 1958) 187, for example, refers to the Chinese translation as "médiocre et incomplète"; E. Frauwallner, *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*, 195 says it "is not only incomplete but also full of gaps". "The Chinese translation", he says, "is also much less exact than the Tibetan one". Lévi, *JA* (1912) 509 had even earlier said: "Du Vinaya des Mūla-Sarvāstivādins, nous avons deux traductions: une en

chinois, par Yi-tsing, du type des 'belles infidèles'; une autre en tibétain, scrupuleusement littérale". J. W. de Jong, "Les *sūtrapiṭaka* des sarvāstivādin et des mūlasarvāstivādin", in *Mélanges d'indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou* (Paris: 1968) 401, has, "en comparant les versions chinoise et tibétaine du *Vinaya* des Mūlasarvāstivādin", argued that some of these characterizations are unjustified, that some of the omissions in I-tsing's translation can be accounted for since "les manuscrits de Gilgit prouvent qu'il [I-tsing] a dû traduire une recension plus brève"; but see also E. Huber, "Études bouddhiques I. — Les fresques inscrites de Turfan", *BEFEO* 14 (1914) 13—14.

[11] See below and n. 50.

[12] *Pāli Vinaya* i, 302 ff; I. B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline* (London: 1951) Vol. IV, 434 ff; for some discussion on the problems of inheritance and the Pāli *Vinaya* see U. Gaung, *A Digest of the Burmese Buddhist Law concerning Inheritance and Marriage* (Rangoon: 1908) Vol. I, 447—68; R. Lingat, "Vinaya et droit laique. Etudes sur les conflits de la loi religieuse et de la loi laïque dans l'indochine hinayaniste", *BEFEO* 37 (1937) 415—77; esp. 443 ff.

[13] See J. Gernet, *Les aspects économique du bouddhisme dans la société chinoise du v^e^ au x^e^ siècle* (Paris: 1956) 61 ff — though dealing primarily with China, Gernet's study is still probably the best thing we have on the economic structures of Indian Buddhist monasteries as they are described in texts of Indian origin.

[14] *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 113—48.

[15] *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 117 ff.

[16] For *yogaṃ manasikāram* the Tibetan translation has only *yid la byed pa* (*Derge* 3, 204; *Tog* 3, 267; *Peking* 41, 279-5). Compare the list of activities ignored in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda* passage with the similar but divergent list found at *Pāli Vinaya* i 190 (*riñcanti uddesaṃ paripucchaṃ adhisīlaṃ adhicittaṃ adhipaññaṃ* — said of monks preoccupied with making and ornamenting shoes), iii 235 (said of nuns preoccupied with washing, dyeing and combing sheep's wool).

[17] *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts* vi, fol. 848.7—9; *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 120.3—4 — Tibetan: *Derge* 3, 204; *Tog* 3, 267; *Peking* 41, 279-5.

[18] Tibetan *gsol ba byed pa na*, and context, both suggest that something like *jñaptyāṃ kriyamāṇāyāṃ* has dropped out of the Gilgit manuscript; cf. the following note.

[19] The *Cīvara-vastu*, the *vastu* in which this passage occurs in the Sanskrit text may not have been translated by I-tsing into Chinese (See Frauwallner, *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*, 195). Durt, however, refers to a very similar list of "five occasions" which occurs in the *Vinaya-saṃgraha* (Taisho 1458): "1° battement de gong . . . 2° récitation du Sankei Mujōkyō . . . le sūtra tripartite . . . 3° salutation profonde . . . 4° distribution de Bâtonnets . . . 5° proclamation d'une motion . . .", (H. Durt, "Chū", Hôbôgirin, cinquième fascicule (Paris/Tokyo: 1979) 437) and I-tsing certainly knew the *Cīvara-vastu*. At least one entire chapter of his *Record* is in fact a translation of a long passage from this *vastu*, as N. Dutt pointed out long ago (Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, x—xi) — the chapter in question is number xxxvi (see, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practiced in India and the Malay Archipelago by I-tsing*, trans. J. Takakusu (London: 1896) 189—93). — The failure to recognize that this chapter of the *Record* was a translation of part of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* has misled a number of scholars who have presented it as a reflection of actual monastic practice in India at the time of I-tsing's visit — cf. Lingat,

SCHOPEN, GREGORY, ***On Avoiding Ghosts and Social Censure: Monastic Funerals in the Mulasarvastivada-Vinaya*** , Journal of Indian Philosophy, 20:1 (1992:Mar.) p.1

BEFEO 37 (1937) 464; Gernet, *Les aspects économiques du bouddhisme dans la société chinoise du v^e^ au x^e^ siècle*, 71—73; A. Bareau, "Indian and Ancient Chinese Buddhism: Institutions Analogous to the Jisa", *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 3 (1961) 447; A. Bareau, "Etude du bouddhisme. Aspects du bouddhisme indien décrits par I-tsing", *ACF* 1989—1990, 631—40.) The fact that the *Cīvara-vastu* is not now found in the *Taishō* may only indicate that it was one of I-tsing's works that was lost after his death (cf. A. Hirakawa, *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns* (Patna: 1982) 12). For a detailed description of the procedure involved in distributing "tickets" mentioned in our passage see the article by Durt mentioned above.

[20] *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 120.6; *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 4, 79.13; *Avadānaśataka* i 272.1 (cf. L. Feer, *Avadāna-çataka. Cent légendes bouddhiques* (Paris: 1891) 185, who translates *muṇḍikā gaṇḍī* by "la cloche funèbre".)

[21] *Peking* 41, 279-5; *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 4, 79 n. 3; *Peking* 40, 184-3.

[22] This is especially clear in the monastic funeral described in *Avadānaśataka* i 271 ff: *tato 'sya sabrahmacāribhir muṇḍikāṃ gaṇḍīṃ parāhatya śarīrābhinirhāraḥ kṛtaḥ / tato 'sya śarīre śarīrapūjāṃ kṛtvā vihāram āgatāḥ /*. It is almost equally clear that this *avadāna* is a narrative elaboration of the much simpler accounts in the *Cīvara-vastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in which the first set of rules governing monastic funerals is presented (see below; on the 'sectarian' affiliation of the *Avadānaśataka* see J.-U. Hartmann, "Zur Frage der Schulzugehörigkeit des Avadānaśataka", in *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, Hrsg. H. Bechert, Erster Teil (Göttingen: 1985) 219—24).

[23] See below n. 62.

[24] *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 144.14, in the account of the death of a monk who had left his bowl and robe in the keeping of others: *viṣūcitaḥ kālagataḥ / sa bhikṣubhiḥ śmaśānaṃ nītvā dagdhaḥ / dharmaśravaṇaṃ dattam / anupūrveṇa vihāraḥ praviṣṭaḥ /*.

[25] *Derge* 10, 226.2, in an account of the funeral of Mahāprajāpatī in which the Buddha himself is given a prominent part.

[26] See below n. 63.

[27] M. Helffer, "Le gandi: un simandre tibétain d'origine indienne", *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 15 (1983) 112—25; I. Vandor, "The Gandi: A Musical Instrument of Buddhist India Recently Identified in a Tibetan Monastery", *The World of Music* 17 (1975) 24—27. (cf. S. Lévi & Éd. Chavannes, "Quelques titres énigmatiques dans la hiérarchie ecclésiastique du bouddhisme indien", JA (1915) 213—215.) References to the use of the *gaṇḍī* are frequent in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* — see, as a sample, *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 145, 156, 158; iii 3, 9; iii 4, 35, 36, 37, 81, 92; *Saṅghabheda-vastu* ii 83; *Śayanāsana & Adhikaraṇa-vastus* 41, 55, 85, 106; etc. It is interesting to note that striking "la tablette du cloître, . . . cette sorte de gong funèbre", also signalled the beginning of monastic funerals in Medieval Western monasteries (Gougaud, *Review mabillon* (1929) 281, 290), and its function there too marks the communal nature of the event (Lemaître, *Prieurs et prieurés dans l'occident médiéval*, 185: ". . . on sonne le claquoir (*tabula*) pour réunir les frères . . .").

[28] *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts* iv, fol. 852.3—5; *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 126.17—127.3 — Tibetan: *Derge* 3, 210.2—4; *Tog* 3, 275.5—276.1; *Peking* 41, 280—5—4 to 5—6.

[29] S. Lévi, "Les éléments de formation du Divyāvadāna", *TP* 8 (1907) 105—22, esp. 122 ("De ce point de vue, la langue du Mūla Sarvāstivāda Vinaya prend, par ses

étrangetés même, une importance exceptionnelle; elle montre le sanscrit de Pāṇini entraîné par la circulation de la vie réelle, en voie d'altération normale, sur les confins des pracrits . . ."); Gnoli, *Saṅghabhedavastu* i xx n. 2.

30 Both here and in II and III below, the Tibetan translators appear to have construed the dead monk's speech as a rhetorical question. The Tibetan in fact looks like it might be translating an interrogative *mā* construction (cf. *BHSG* §§ 42.12—42.16); in III, the final text in this series cited below, the manuscript itself has a negative in the parallel construction, but it is *na* not *mā*.

31 *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 127.5 (*bhikṣavas tam abhinirhṛtya*, of the dead body of an ordinary monk); *Pravrajyāvastu*, fol. 12r.2 (*bahir api nirhṛtya*, of the dead body of the teacher Saṃjayin); *Divyāvadāna* 281.30 (*śibikābhir nirharitvā*, of the dead body of Aśoka); *Avadānaśataka* i 272.1 (*sabrahmacāribhir . . . śarīrābhinirhāraḥ kṛtaḥ*, of the body of a dead monk); *Udāna* 8.21 (*sarīrakaṃ mañcakaṃ āropetvā nīharitvā*, of the dead body of an ascetic); *Pali Vinaya* iv 308 (*bhikkhuniyo taṃ bhikkhuniṃ nīharitvā*, of the dead body of a nun); etc. — there are, of course, other technical meanings for *abhinirhāra*; cf. M. H. F. Jayasuriya, "A Note on Pali *abhinīhāra* and Cognate Forms in the Light of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit", in *Añjali. Papers on Indology and Buddhism* (O. H. de A. Wijesekera Volume) (Peradeniya: 1970) 50—54.

32 J. Jain, *Life in Ancient India as Depicted in the Jain Canon and Commentaries. 6th Century B.C. to 17th Century A.D.*, 2nd ed. (New Delhi: 1984) 281—84; esp. 283 where *nīharaṇa* is cited as the term for "the ceremony of taking out the dead".

33 *ādahanaṃ nītvā: Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 127.13 (*dur khrod du khyer te*; of the body of a monk); iii 2, 125.14 (*sreg tu khyer nas*; of the body of a monk); *śmaśānaṃ nītvā: Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 144.14 (*dur khrod du bsregs nas*; of the body of a monk); *tam ādāya dahanaṃ gatāḥ: Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 118.15 (*de khyor te sreg tu dong ngo*; of the body of a monk) — cf. *Saṅghabhedavastu* i 70; 163; *Derge* 10, 224 ff; 444; 472; *Divyāvadāna* 428; etc. It will, perhaps, be clear from even the small sample cited here that the Tibetan translations of the terms and phrases involved are neither consistent nor exact; cf. n. 38 below.

34 *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts* vi, fol. 852.5—8; *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 127.4—11 — Tibetan: *Derge* 3, 210.4—6; *Tog* 3, 276.1—5; *Peking* 41, 280—5—6 to 281—1—1.

35 G. Schopen, "Monks and the Relic Cult in the *Mahāparinibbānasutta*: An Old Misunderstanding in Regard to Monastic Buddhism", in *From Benares to Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religions in Honour of Prof. Jan Yün-hua*, ed. G. Schopen & K. Shinohara (Oakville: 1991) 187—201.

36 On the meaning of the term *pūjā* and the kinds and range of activities it can refer to see J. Charpentier, "The Meaning and Etymology of Pūjā", *Indian Antiquary* 56 (1927) 93—99; 130—36; L. de la Vallée Poussin, "Totémisme et Végétalisme", *Bulletin de la classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques, Académie Royale de belgique*, 5ᵉ série, T.XV (1929) 37—52; P. Thieme, "Indische Wörter und Sitten", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Mörgenländischen Gesellschaft* 93 (1939) 105—39; esp. 105—23; A. L. Basham, "The Evolution of the Concept of the Bodhisattva", in *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhism*, ed. L. S. Kawamura (Waterloo: 1981) 19—59; esp. 35—36; G. E. Ferro-Luzzi, "*Abhiṣeka*, the Indian Rite that Defies Definition", *Anthropos* 76 (1981) 707—42; A. Ostor, *Puja in Society* (Lucknow: 1982); D. D. Malvania, "The Word pūjā and Its Meaning", *Indologica Taurinensia* 14 (1987—88) 269—73; etc.

[37] See below n. 43.

[38] T. W. Rhys Davids & W. Stede, *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary* (London: 1921—25) 698 s.v. *sarīra*. It is worth noting here that the handling of the term *śarīra-pūjā* by the Tibetan translators is far from satisfactory and a long way from their usual consistency. In this passage and in III cited below *śarīra-pūjā* is translated by *ro la mchod pa, ro la mchod pa byas la*, and *ro la mchod pa byas; ro* means first "dead body, corpse, carcass", then "body", then "residue, remains, sediment". *Avadānaśataka* ii 272.2, however, which reads *śarīrābhinirhāraḥ kṛtaḥ / tato 'sya śarīre śarīra-pūjāṃ kṛtvā* is translated *rus bu phyir phyung ngo / de nas de'i rus bu la rus bu'i mchod pa byas nas*. Here, then, where the first occurrence of *śarīra*, and almost certainly the second and third, can only mean "body", the Tibetan translates it in all three instances by *rus bu* which can only mean "small bone" or "bones in general". Again, especially in the first instance, *śarīra* cannot possibly mean "bone" since the context makes it certain that it refers to a newly dead "body" which has not even been removed from the monk's cell, let alone cremated. Likewise, in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* there are several occurrences of the term *śarīra-pūjā* in passages narrating events which preceded the cremation, that is to say prior to the time that there could have been any "bones" or "relics". At 36.2, where Ānanda asks what should be done with the body of the Buddha after his death, *śarīra-pūjāyām autsukyam āpadyemahi* is translated by *sku gdung la . . . mchod pa ji snyed cig brtson par bgyi lags* (similarly at 46.4); at 48.8, where the wandering Ājīvaka tells Mahākāśyapa that the Buddha is dead and that his body was honored for seven days, *śarīre śarīrapūjā* is translated by *sku gdung la mchod pa bgyis pa*); but at 49.19, where Kāśyapa formulates his intention to personally repeat the *śarīra-pūjā* of the Buddha's body that had already been performed by the Mallas, he says: *yan nv ahaṃ svayam eva bhagavataḥ śarīrapūjāyām autsukyam āpadyeya*, and this is translated into Tibetan by *ma la bdag nyid kyis bcom ldan 'das la mchod pa'i las bya'o snyam du spro ba bskyed nas*. In other words, in the same text, *śarīra* is sometimes translated by *sku gdung*, which is the respect form of *rus* and means first of all — if not exclusively — "bone", in contexts where there could not yet have been any "bone"; or it is sometimes not translated at all: 49.19, where the Sanskrit text has "worship of the body of the Blessed One", the Tibetan has simply "worship of the Blessed One" himself. There are, moreover, numerous instances where we do not have the Sanskrit original, but where it was almost certainly *śarīra-pūjā*. Here too there is considerable variation: at *Derge* 10, 480, for example, immediately after Śāriputra's death a fellow monk is said to have *śā ri'i bu'i ring bsrel la lus kyis mchod pa byas te*. Context makes it virtually certain that this can only refer to funeral procedures, and it is very likely that the original read *śarīre śarīrapūjā*, but in spite of this the Tibetan literally means something like "performing the worship with the body on the *relics* of Śāriputra". Later in the same account — *Derge* 10, 488 — where again the original almost certainly had *śarīre śarīrapūjā*, and where the reference is undoubtedly to post-cremation remains, the Tibetan has *ring bsrel la ring bsrel gyi mchod pa bgyi'o*. In the account of the death of Mahāprajāpatī (*Derge* 10, 224 ff) we find *lus la mchod pa*; in the account of the death of Prasenajit (*Derge* 10, 174) we find both *khog pa la mchod pa* and *lus la mchod pa*; in the account of the death of the monk Gavāṃpati, *rus pa la rus pa'i mchod pa* (*Derge* 10, 606) — in all these cases the original was almost certainly *śarīrapūjā* or *śarīre śarīrapūjā*. It is not impossible that a systematic survey of the

Tibetan handling of the term might reveal meaningful patterns in what now appears to be confusion, but such a survey has yet to be done. It is also worth noting that — although rare — there are traces of the use of the term *śarīra-pūjā* to refer not to a funereal procedure, but to honor directed towards post-cremational remains. This appears to be the case several times in the account concerning the remains of Śāriputra at *Derge* 10, 488 ff; likewise, at *Divyāvadāna* 252.10, when Aśoka expresses his desire to honor the stūpas of the Buddha's famous disciples, the Sanskrit text has him say *teṣāṃ śarīrapūjāṃ kariṣyāmi* (J. Przyluski, *La légende de l'empereur Açoka (Açoka-avadāna) dans les textes indiens et chinois* (Annales du musée guimet, 32) (Paris: 1923) 257, however, translates the parallel passage in the *A-yü-wang-chuan* (Taisho 2042) as " 'Je veux maintenant honorer les *stūpa* des grands disciples . . .' "); see also Schopen, *From Benares to Beijing*, 195 ff. Note, finally, that the Sanskrit sources themselves do not always use the term *śarīra-pūjā*; cf. n. 70.

[39] *Divyāvadāna* 281.30 (note that for Vaidya's *śibikābhir nirharitvā śarīrapūjāṃ kṛtvā rājānaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayiṣyāma*, the text given in S. Mukhopadhyaya, *The Aśokāvadāna. Sanskrit Text compared with Chinese Versions* (New Delhi: 1963) 132.7 provides an important variant: *śivikābhir nirharitvā śarīrapūjāṃ kṛtvā dhmāpayitvā rājānaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayiṣyāma* — this reading makes it very clear that *śarīrapūjā* preceded cremation); *Derge* 10, 174. The fact that known kings — including and especially Aśoka — did not receive the funeral of a Cakravartin only emphasizes the purely ideal, if not entirely artificial character of both the idea and the description of such a funeral in the texts and the fourfold classification of those "worthy of a stūpa" as well; cf. A. Bareau, *Recherches sur la biographie du buddha dans le sūtrapiṭaka et les vinayapiṭaka anciens: II. Les derniers mois, le parinirvāṇa et les funérailles*, T.II (Paris: 1971) 50 ff; G. de Marco, *I "Kuṣāṇa" nella vita del Buddha. Per una Analisi del Rapporto tra Potere Politico e Religione nell' Antico Gandhāra* (Supplemento n. 34 agli *Annali*) (Napoli: 1983) 47—54; etc.

[40] *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts* vi, fol. 852.8—10; *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 127.12—18 — Tibetan: *Derge* 3, 210.7—211.2; *Tog* 3, 276.5—277.1; *Peking* 41, 281—1—1 to 1—3.

[41] *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 144.14; *Derge* 10, 472.2 ff; *Derge* 10, 224.6 ff; *Avadāna-śataka* i 272 ff; etc. — reference to both or either is not, however, invariably found in references to monastic funerals. Sometimes such references contain only phrases like *tam ādahane saṃskārya* or *tam ādahanaṃ nītvā saṃskārya* (*Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 118.16; 125.4), where a recitation of Dharma and transfer of merit are probably simply understood. — For the importance of performing a "pūjā of the teacher (i.e. the Buddha)" (*śāstuś ca pūjā*) for a dying but not yet dead monk see *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 124.11 ff. — It is again worth noting the similar procedures stipulated in "les coutumiers monastiques" composed in the Medieval West: ". . . on annonce la nouvelle au chapitre et l'on fait aussitôt un office pour le défunt, avec sonnerie de cloches"; "les frères résidant dans cette dépendance (prieuré, prévôté, etc. . . .) font pour le mort ce qui se fait dans le monastère, c'est-à-dire l'office des morts pendant sept jours, avec glas le premier jour, distribution d'une pitance (*justicia*) pendant trente jours avec chant du psaume *Verba mea* (Ps. 141) et de cinq autres psaumes pour le défunt" (Lemaître, *Prieurs et prieurés dans l'occident médiéval*, 185; Gougaud, *Revue Mabillon* (1929) 281 ff.

[42] For what is probably still the best discussion of the subtleties sometimes involved

in what is called the "transfer of merit" see J. Filliozat, "Sur le domaine sémantique de *puṇya*", in *Indianisme et bouddhisme. Mélanges offerts à mgr. Étienne Lamotte* (Louvain-la-neuve: 1980) 102—116.

[43] See — noting the language used to express such "transfers" — *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 1, 220.12 (*nāmnā dakṣiṇām ādiśeyam* — to pretas who were the deceased relatives of a group of laymen); *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 4, 181.5, 18; 182.12 (*nāmnā dakṣiṇām ādeśaya* — to deceased relatives); *Derge* 10, 472.2 ff (*yon bsngo zhing* — to a deceased monk); *Śayanāsana &Adhikaraṇa-vastus* 37.7 (*nāmnā dakṣiṇā ādeṣṭavyā*- 37.11; *nāmnā dakṣiṇām uddiśasi* — both to deceased donors who had given *vihāras* to the Order); *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 4, 161.1 (*nāmnā dakṣiṇām ādekṣyati* — to deceased parents by a son); *Rab tu 'byuṅ ba'i gźi* ii 41.9 (*miṅ gis yon bsṅo ba byed par gyur cig* — to deceased parents by a son); for literature related to this Vinaya see *Avadānaśataka* i 272.13 (*nāmnā dakṣiṇā ādiṣṭā* — to a deceased monk by the Buddha); *Divyāvadāna* 1.23; 286.24; *Avadānaśataka* i 15.1; 197.3; 277.2; etc. — all to deceased parents by a son). There are as well instances which use the same vocabulary but where the transfer is directed to living beings: *Saṅghabhedavastu* i 199.25 *dakṣiṇā ādiṣṭā* — by the Buddha to his father); *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 4, 80 (*dakṣiṇādeṣṭavyeti* — connected with the Poṣadha — cf. the last verse of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Prātimokṣa Sūtra: prātimokṣasamuddeśād yat puṇyaṃ samupārjitaṃ / aśeṣas tena lokoyaṃ maunīndraṃ padam āpnuyāt //* — A. C. Banerjee, *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit* (Calcutta: 1977) 56); *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* 6.10, 6.13 (*nāmnā dakṣiṇām ādiśava; dakṣiṇām ādiśet* — to local devas). In his work on the Pāli *Petavatthu* H. S. Gehman noted and carefully studied parallel expressions (H. S. Gehman, "Ādisati, Anvādisati, Anudisati and Uddisati in the Petavatthu", *JAOS* 43 (1923) 410—21). In a short note written long before the Sanskrit text of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* was available, he also argued that expressions like *nāmnā dakṣiṇādeśana* in the *Avadānaśataka* were "Pālisms" (H. S. Gehman, "A Pālism in Buddhist Sanskrit", *JAOS* 44 (1924) 73—75). But in fact it now appears that such expressions are much more firmly anchored in Sanskrit — especially Mūlasarvāstivāda — sources and are of limited and late occurrence in Pāli sources: they occur frequently only in texts like the *Petavatthu*, very rarely elsewhere — at *Aṅguttara* iii 43 (*petānaṃ dakkhiṇaṃ anuppadassati*) and once in the Pāli *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* (I.31: *tāsaṃ dakkhiṇam ādise* — the same expression in the same verse also appears in the parallel accounts to the *Mahāparinibbāna* passage that are now found at *Udāna* 85 ff and *Pāli Vinaya* i 228 ff). This pattern of occurrence of the expression *dakkhiṇam ādis-* in Pāli sources — noting especially its occurrence in the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* — parallels that of the term *śarīra-pūjā*. Both are firmly rooted and frequent in *Mūlasarvāstivāda* sources (see above n. 38), both are rare in anything but "late" Pāli sources, but both occur prominently in the Pāli *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* (cf. J. P. McDermott, *Development in the Early Buddhist Concept of Kamma/Karma* (New Delhi: 1984) 41 ff, although his views are not themselves free of problems). It is possible that we may have in both expressions indications of the influence of continental sources on canonical Pāli. It is worth noting too that at least the expression *dakṣiṇādeśana* is not limited to Mūlasarvāstivāda sources. In the *Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācāra-saṃgraha-ṭīkā* of Jayarakṣita, for example, the term occurs and is provided with a 'definition': *dakṣiṇādeśanañ ca dānagāthāpāṭhaḥ* (Sanghasena, ed.,

Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṅgrahaṭīkā (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series XI) (Patna: 1968) 36.10): " 'Assignment of gift' is the reading of gift-verses" (J. D. M. Derrett, *A Textbook for Novices. Jayarakṣita's "Perspicuous Commentary on the Compendium of Conduct by Śrīghana"* (Pubblicazioni di Indologica Taurinensia XV) (Torino: 1983) 44). This work it appears is affiliated with the Mahāsāṅghika (cf. M. Shimoda, "The *Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṅgrahaṭīkā* and the Chinese *Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya*", *IBK* 39.1 (1990) 495—92. Finally, for some interesting suggestions concerning the background of the expression see B. Oguibenine, "La dakṣiṇā dans le Ṛgveda et le transfert de mérite dans le bouddhisme", in *Indological and Buddhist Studies. Volume in Honour of Professor J. W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. L. A. Hercus et al. (Canberra: 1982) 393—414.

[44] Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. IV, 257.

[45] *Śrautakośa. Encyclopedia of Vedic Sacrificial Literature*, Vol. I-English Section; Part II (Poona: 1962) 1037.

[46] This same congruency may also allow us a better understanding of some otherwise puzzling elements in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*. The Sanskrit version, for example, goes to some trouble to indicate that although the funereal *śarīra-pūjā* had already been performed for the Buddha when Mahākāśyapa finally reached Kuśinagara he nevertheless is made to repeat the entire procedure himself (49.18—20). This at first sight seems both odd and unnecessary. But it makes perfect sense if — as is not unlikely — the compiler of the text 'knew' that Kāśyapa was the chief heir of the Buddha (cf. *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 1, 259—60), and if he 'knew' that for a monk to inherit he must perform or participate in the funeral of the deceased. Seen from this point of view Kāśyapa could not be what he was supposed to be unless he had performed the *śarīra-pūjā* or had participated in the funeral. Kāśyapa's role in the Pāli version of the text — though slightly less odd — can also be explained in this way.

[47] R. F. Gombrich, *Precept and Practice. Traditional Buddhism in the Rural Highlands of Ceylon* (Oxford: 1971) 243.

[48] Something similar has somewhat hesitantly been noted by Knipe in regard to Hindu funereal practice: "The doctrines of transmigration and liberation transformed the whole of ancient Indian speculation and practice, but the rites accorded the ancestors bear a stamp of rigorous antiquity. They appear to endure beside the newer sentiments of *saṃsāra* and *mokṣa*". "The ritual world view of early vedic religion could abide through several strenuous periods via the directives of the *sūtras* and *śāstras* for individual funeral and ancestral rites, with remarkably little tampering from innovative doctrines, theologies, and cosmographies that gradually eroded the official, institutional structures of vedic religion. Although the concern shifted from the early vedic desire for a state of perpetual non-death or immortality to the dilemmas of *saṃsāra* and the ideal of *mokṣa*, the intention of the *śrāddhas* survived, and the understanding of the passage of the deceased as a cosmogonic progression, with an individual's salvation dependent on the correct ritual activity of his descendants, permitted these archaic ceremonies for the dead to continue to the present day"; D. M. Knipe, "*Sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*: the Hindu Rite of Entry into Heaven", in *Religious Encounters with Death. Insights from the History and Anthropology of Religions*, ed. F. E. Reynolds & E. H. Waugh (University Park & London: 1977) 111—24, esp. 112, 121—22.

[49] Rockhill, *The Life of the Buddha and the Early History of His Order*, 112.
[50] L. de La Vallée Poussin, "Staupikam", *HJAS* 2 (1935) 286—87.
[51] A. Seidel, "Dabi", *Hôbôgirin*, sixième fascicule (Paris/Tokyo: 1983) 577 f.
[52] *Derge* 10, 472.2—474.1; *Tog* 9, 704.7—707.5; *Peking* 44, 91—4—3 to 92—1—1. The footnote numbers inserted into the text refer to the separate critical apparatus which follows it and in which variants — most of little consequence — are recorded.
[53] This entire paragraph is made up of sterotypic phrases used to describe an orthodox union and birth — cf. *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 1—2, 52; iii 4, 6; 15; 23; 24; 28; 29; 53; *Śayanāsana & Adhikaraṇa-vastus* 13; *Saṅghabhedavastu* i 27; *Rab tu 'byuṅ ba'i gẑi* ii 7; 21; 23; 42; *Pravrajyāvastu*, 312; *Divyāvadāna* 2; *Avadānaśataka* i 206; 261; 295; etc.
[54] For the whole of what has been abbreviated here see Feer, *Avadāna-çataka*, 3; *Pravrajyāvastu* 16.
[55] As with the Sanskrit texts from the *Cīvara-vastu* treated above, so here in the Tibetan text the style is sometimes elliptical and there is a considerable reliance on pronouns whose referents sometimes need to be drawn out.
[56] The Sanskrit is cited from *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 140.14.
[57] For the Sanskrit underlying much of this paragraph cf. *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 1, 285.17 ff: (said of a monk bitten by a snake) *sa tathā vihvalo brāhmaṇagṛhapatibhir dṛṣṭaḥ / te kathayanti / bhavantaḥ katarasyâyaṃ gṛhapateḥ putra iti / aparaiḥ samākhyātam / amukasya iti / te kathayanti / anāthānāṃ śramaṇaśākyaputrīyāṇāṃ madhye pravrajitaḥ / yadi na pravrajito 'bhaviṣyat jñātibhir asya cikitsā kāritā abhaviṣyad iti /*; see also *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 1, ix. 10, although the passage there involves considerable reconstruction. Note too that our text has no word for "funeral" which I supply both here and below. A literal translation would be more like "would surely have performed the honors/ceremonies", "honors/ceremonies for a (deceased) monk are to be performed", etc. — For Sanskrit phrases which might lie behind *rim gro byas par 'gyur ba*, etc., see below n. 70.
[58] So de La Vallée Poussin, *HJAS* 2 (1935) 286, translates the Chinese. In a note he suggests the Chinese was translating *śarīra-pūjā*, but the Tibetan would not support this; cf. n. 38 above.
[59] So de La Vallée Poussin, *HJAS* 2 (1935) 286; Seidel *Hôbôgirin*, sixième fasc. 578.
[60] So de La Vallée Poussin, *HJAS* 2 (1935) 286; Seidel *Hôbôgirin*, sixième fasc. 578; cf. J. Przyluski, "Le partage des reliques du buddha", *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 4 (1935—36) 341—67; esp. 345—46.
[61] It is virtually certain that Tibetan *yon bsngo zhing* here is translating some form of *dakṣiṇām ādiś-*; cf. *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* 6.10: *nāmnā dakṣiṇām ādiśasva = yon sngo ba mdzad du gsol*; 6.13: *dakṣiṇām ādiśet = yon bsngo byas; Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 127.18: *dakṣiṇām uddiśya = yon bsngo ba byas nas*; etc.
[62] Determining the precise referent of the term or title *Tridaṇḍaka* is not as easy as one might expect. Modern scholars, on the basis of good Chinese evidence (I-tsing, colophons from Tun Huang) have with differing degrees of certainty seen in *Tridaṇḍaka* a reference to a specific text. Taishō 801, the text in question, has in fact been assigned in various Chinese sources two titles: *(Fo shuo) wu ch'ang ching*, "Sūtra (Spoken by the Buddha) on Impermanency", a title which has been taken as a translation of a Sanskrit title something like *Anityatā-sūtra*; and *San ch'i ching*, "Sūtra des Trois Ouvertures" or "les trois 'informations' ". Sometimes the second title is given

as an alternative, sometimes the two titles are simply combined into one: *Fo shuo wu ch'ang san ch'i ching* (de La Vallée Poussin renders the Chinese corresponding to our *Kṣudraka* passage by "récite les trois 'informations', *K'i* [et] le Sūtra sur l'impermanence", *HJAS* 2 (1935) 287). Taishō 801, or the *Anityatā-sūtra*, would appear to be well suited for a funeral text (see the Sanskrit version edited in I. Yamada, "Anityatāsūtra", *IBK* 20.2 (1972) 1001—996); it appears, moreover, from at least Takakusu's translation, that I-tsing says in his description of a monastic funeral in his *Record* that "while the corpse is burning . . . the 'Sūtra on Impermanence' (Anitya-sūtra) is recited" (Takakusu, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practiced in India and the Malay Archipelago*, 81—82 — Bareau, however, in summarizing the passage says only: "Un moine récite un bref sermon (*sūtra*) sur l'impermanence (*anityatā*) . . .", *ACF* 1989—90, 636); in the account of the funeral of Mahāprajāpatī in the *Kṣudraka*, finally, the Buddha himself is said to have expounded teachings connected with impermanence" (*mi rtag pa dang ldan pa'i chos dag bshad nas; Derge* 10, 226.2). All of this would seem to argue for identifying the *Tridaṇḍaka* with the *Anityatā-sūtra.* But there are still other indications that would seem to suggest that the *Tridaṇḍaka* was not, in fact, a specific text but a kind of ritual formulary into which any given text could be inserted. Although I-tsing does not appear to refer to the *Tridaṇḍaka* in his description of a monastic funeral, he does refer to it elsewhere in his *Record* and his description of it is of considerable interest. Lévi has translated the passage as follows: "Dans les pays occidentaux, l'adoration des caitya et le service ordinaire se font à la fin de l'après-midi ou au crépuscule . . . Quand tout le monde est définitivement assis, un maître des sūtra monte sur le siège aux lions (*siṃhāsana*) et déclame *un peu de sūtra* . . . Quant aux textes sacrés qu'on récite, c'est surtout les Trois Ouvertures qu'on récite. C'est un recueil dû au vénérable *Ma ming* (Aśvaghoṣa). La première partie compte dix vers; l'objet du texte est d'exalter les Trois Joyaux. Ensuite vient un texte sacré proprement dit, prononcé par le Buddha en personne. Après l'hymne et la récitation, il y a encore plus de dix vers, qui ont trait à la déflexion des mérites (*pariṇāmanā*) et à la production du voeu (*praṇidhāna*). Comme il y a trois parties qui s'ouvrent successivement, on appelle ce texte sacré les Trois Ouvertures" (S. Lévi, "Sur la récitation primitive des textes bouddhiques", *JA* (1915) 401—47, esp. 432—34; cf. Takakusu, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practiced in India and the Malay Archipelago*, 152—53; R. Fujishima, "Deux chapitres extraits des mémoires d'I-tsing sur son voyage dans l'inde", *JA* (1888) 411—39, esp. 416—18). This passage is important in at least two ways. First, the *Tridaṇḍaka* described here is not a specific text, but a set form of recitation consisting of three parts: (1) praise of the three precious things; followed by (2) the recitation of "un texte sacré proprement dit"; with the sequence concluded by (3) a formal transfer of merit. The "texte sacré" is unspecified and can apparently be any text suitable to the occasion of the recitation. The second important thing that I-tsing's description indicates would point in the same direction. We have seen so far in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* that the recitation of the *Tridaṇḍaka* is one of the specified moments for the distribution of a deceased monk's estate, and that it is recited as a part of a monastic funeral. I-tsing's description, however, makes it clear that these were not the only ritual contexts in which the *Tridaṇḍaka* was used. His description would seem to indicate that it was also used during the daily "adoration des caitya et le service ordinaire", and to these ritual moments we can add others. The *Poṣadha-vastu* of the *Mūlasarvās-*

tivāda-vinaya, for example, associates the recitation of the *Tridaṇḍaka* with the fortnightly communal recitation of the *Prātimokṣa* which is often presented as the most important congregational ritual in Buddhist monasticism (see *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 4, 80.5 where details concerning the appropriate length of its recitation are given) and this association is repeated in the *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo* which characterizes the *Tridaṇḍaka* as a procedure or method of practice connected with the Upoṣadha (*gso sbyong gi sbyor chog cig ste* — its description of the *Tridaṇḍaka* as a recitative formulary corresponds almost exactly to I-tsing's: . . . *phyag 'tshal ba'i rgyud / mdo 'don pa'i rgyud / bsngo ba'i rgyud de rgyud gsum dang ldan pa'i sgo nas tshul khrims rnam dag gi mdo la sogs pa'i chos bshad cing nyan par byed pa'o /*; Kraṅ dbyi sun, ed., *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo* (Beijing: 1985) Vol. 1, 577). Elsewhere in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, moreover, the recitation of the *Tridaṇḍaka* is prescribed in the ritual required before cutting down a tree (see the text cited in K. Tokiya, "The Anityatā-sūtra Quoted in the Tibetan Version of a Mūlasarvāstivāda Text", *IBK* 34.1 (1985) 164); etc. It is, therefore, not just the structure of the *Tridaṇḍaka* as it is described by I-tsing, but also its use in a variety of different ritual contexts which suggests that it might well have been not a specific text but a specific set type of recitation or an established formulary into which any given *sūtra* text could be inserted. The Chinese identification of the *Tridaṇḍaka* with the *Anityatā-sūtra* may have resulted from the fact that I-tsing sent home the version of the formulary used for monastic funerals into which the *Anityatā* had been inserted and this came to be considered the only version. All of this will, of course, require further research to settle; so too will the attribution of the formulary to Aśvaghoṣa. For material bearing on both questions see — in addition to the sources already cited — P. Demiéville, "Bombai", *Hôbôgirin*, Premier fasc. (Tokyo: 1929) 93 ff; R. Sāṅkṛtyāyana, "Search for Sanskrit Mss. in Tibet", *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 24.4 (1938) 157—60; E. H. Johnston, "The *Tridaṇḍamālā* of Aśvaghoṣa", *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 25 (1939) 11—14; Lin Li-Kouang, *L'aide-mémoire de la vraie loi* (Paris: 1949) 303—05; L. Giles, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Chinese Manuscripts from Tunhuang in the British Museum* (London: 1957) 114—15; Durt, *Hôbôgirin*, Cinquième fasc., 437; P. Demiéville, "Notes on Buddhist Hymnology in the Far East", in *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Walpola Rahula*, ed. S. Balasooriya, et al. (London: 1980) 50 n. 31; Seidel, *Hôbôgirin*, Sixième fasc., 577—78; etc.

[63] de la Vallée Poussin, *HJAS* 2 (1935) 287 — here again we have a case where what should be a straightforward referent turns out not to be so. The problems start with an old one. Tibetan translations almost never distinguish between *stūpa* and *caitya*, both terms almost always being rendered by *mchod rten* (there are apparent exceptions, but they are extremely rare — see the *Mchod rten gcig btab na bye ba btab par 'gyur pa'i gzungs* (*Peking* 6, 151—2—2 to 3—2; 11, 168—4—8 to 5—8) where the transliteration *tsai tya* occurs several times). The original that was translated in our passage by *mchod rten la phyag mi 'tshal nas* and *mchod rten la phyag 'tshal bar bya'o* cannot therefore be determined. There is also the fact that the Tibetan versions are not in agreement as to whether the text is referring to one or to several *mchod rtens*: the *Derge* has in the second occurrence *mchod rten la*, but both *Tog* and *Peking* have *mchod rten dag la* (de la Vallée Poussin translates the Chinese as singular). Both considerations may bear on an even more important point: we do not know to whom the *mchod rten* or *mchod rtens* belonged; we do not know whether

the reference is to a stūpa or stūpas of the Buddha, or to the stūpa or stūpas of the local monastic dead — it is now clear that the latter were found in considerable numbers at a considerable number of mostly very early monastic sites in India (cf. Schopen, *JIABS* 14.2 (1991); for some regional variation in regard to whether such structures were called *stūpas* or *caityas* see p. and n. 38). Taking this category into account it is, of course, not impossible that our text might be referring to a stūpa built for the deceased monk whose funeral has just been performed. It appears, however, that at least Mūlasarvāstivāda texts do not seem to link funereal activity *per se* with the erection of stūpas for the local monastic dead. In none of the numerous references to monastic funerals in Mūlasarvāstivāda literature that I know is there any reference to erecting a stūpa. In fact the erection of stūpas for the local monastic dead is legislated separately in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* not in an account of a funeral, but in an account concerning the post-funereal "relics" of Śāriputra (*Derge* 10, 488 ff). This would suggest, I think, that in this *Vinaya* funeral ceremonies and cult activity directed towards relics or reliquaries of the local monastic dead were conceived of as fundamentally different forms of religious behavior. (It is — in so far as I know — only in a few Pāli narrative passages that funeral ceremonies for local monks or nuns are directly linked with the erection of stūpas for them — cf. *Udāna* 8.21; *Pāli Vinaya* iv 308.) In light of these considerations it might be well to assume — until it can be shown otherwise — that *mchod rten (dag) la phyag 'tshal bar bya' o* in our passage refers to worshipping the stūpa or stūpas of the Buddha, and that such an act was the final moment of a monastic funeral. What 'external' evidence we have also would seem to indicate that funeral activity and activity connected with stūpas were thought of as distinct. I-tsing in his *Record* refers to something "like a stūpa" for the local monastic dead, but he seems to indicate that such was not always erected and that when it was it was made an indeterminate time after the funeral: the monks, he says, "on returning [from the cremation] to their apartments, . . . cleanse the floor with powdered cow-dung. All other things remain as usual. There is no custom as to putting on a mourning-dress. They sometimes build a thing like a stūpa for the dead, to contain his *śarīra* (or relics). It is called a 'Kula', which is like a small stūpa, but without the cupola on it" (Takakusu, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practiced in India and the Malay Archipelago* 82; cf. Bareau, *ACF* 1989—1990, 636: "Après la crémation, on recueille les restes corporels (*śarīra*) et on élève sur eux un petit tumulus appelé *kula*. Celui-ci ressemble à un *stūpa*, mais on ne dresse pas de parasols (*chattra*) à roues (*cakra*) à son sommet . . ." — for an attempt to identify what I-tsing calls a *kula* with what is found at a number of monastic sites in India see G. Schopen, "Burial '*ad sanctos*' and the Physical Presence of the Buddha in Early Indian Buddhism: A Study in the Archeology of Religions", *Religion* 17 (1987) 193—225, esp. 198—199). Note too that Rockhill's summary of our text is particularly unsatisfactory at this point: "Previously to being interred the body must be washed. A cairn or tchaitya (*mchod rten*) must be raised over the remains" (*The Life of the Buddha and the Early History of His Order*, 112). There is no justification in the text itself for his interpretation of either injunction: it is the monks who participated in the funeral who must wash, and the *mchod rten* is to be worshipped not "raised".

[64] I. B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*, Vol. I (Oxford: 1938) xvi—xvii.

[65] Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*, Vol. I, xxix.

[66] Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*, Vol. I, xv.

[67] Ch. Malamoud, "Les morts sans visage. Remarques sur l'idéologie funéraire dans le brâhmanisme", in *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes*, ed. G. Gnoli et J.-P. Vernant (Cambridge & Paris: 1982) 441—453, esp. 445, 441, 449.

[68] L. Dumont, *Homo Hierarchicus. The Caste System and Its Implications*; Comp. rev. Eng. ed. (Chicago: 1980) 49—50.

[69] Jain has recently argued that the "elaborate rules for disposing of the dead bodies of Jain monks" found in Jain literature are also early: "The material contained in the *Bhag[avatī] Ārā[dhanā]* belongs to the time of early Jainism when the division of Śvetāmbara and Digambara did not exist in the Jain *saṅgha*" (J. Jain, "Disposal of the Dead in the Bhagavatī Ārādhanā", *JOIB* 38 (1988) 123—131. — Though a late text, see the interesting description of "The Funeral of a Renouncer" in J. P. Olivelle (ed.), *Saṃnyāsapaddhati of Rudradeva* (The Adyar Library Series 114) (Madras: 1986) 63 ff). It should be noted too that the scholarly literature in regard to the date of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is marked by ambivalence and seeming contradictions. Lamotte, for example, notably on the basis of the fact that this *Vinaya* contains a "prediction" relative to Kaniṣka and was not translated into Chinese until the 8th Century, asserts that "on ne peut attribuer à cet ouvrage une date antérieure aux IVᵉ—Vᵉ siècles de notre ère" (*Histoire du bouddhisme indien des origines à l'ère śaka*, 727). But Huber, already in 1914, had drawn very different conclusions from the presence of this prediction relative to Kaniṣka. He had said: "Ce petit fait vient s'ajouter à un certain nombre d'autres déjà connus qui tendent à montrer que le Vinaya des Mūla-Sarvāstivādins a subi un remaniement aux environs de l'ère chrétienne", and then added: "sans discuter la date exacte du roi Kaniṣka, on peut dire que la mention de son nom nous reporte vers le même temps" (E. Huber, "Études bouddhiques III. — Le roi kaniṣka dans le vinaya des mūlasarvāstivādins", *BEFEO* 14 (1914) 19 — Gnoli, *Saṅghabhedavastu* i, xix, has more recently made much the same observation). Moreover, and again long before Lamotte, Lévi had already counseled against attributing too much significance to the date of the Chinese translation: "La date tardive de la traduction chinoise . . . ne doit pas non plus nous entraîner trop vite à tenir l'ouvrage pour récent" (S. Lévi, *TP* 8 (1907) 115 f). To this might be added the fact that dating the compilation of a work does not necessarily date its specific contents: "dans l'état fragmentaire de nos connaissances sur le bouddhisme indien, la date récente du document qui nous fait connaître une légende, ne permet nullement de conclure à la formation récente de la légende elle-même" (Huber, *BEFEO* 14 (1914) 17). This is made strikingly evident in regard to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in another series of observations and investigations. Although he repeatedly characterizes the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* as "tardif" or "le plus récent de tous les recueils disciplinaires", Professor Bareau says as well that the form of the stūpa it describes appears to be the 'most ancient' (A. Bareau, "La construction et le culte des stūpa d'après les vinaya-piṭaka", *BEFEO* 50 (1960) 233). Elsewhere, while still pointing to its 'late' character he says: ". . . d'après des études comparatives approfondies mais très partielles, le *Vinayapiṭaka* des Mūlasarvāstivādin paraît nettement plus archaïque que celui des Sarvāstivādin et même que le plupart des autres *Vinayapiṭaka*" (A. Bareau, *Les sectes bouddhiques du petit véhicule* (Paris: 1955) 154). More specifically Lévi, in a detailed study of certain linguistic forms in the Vinaya, says for example: "L'interdiction de 'boire à la sangsue', promulguée d'abord dans un dialecte qui pratiquait l'adoucissement de la sourde intervocalique, est arrivée telle quelle aux

rédacteurs du canon pali qui n'ont plus reconnu sous son altération le terme original; ainsi des autres écoles, à l'exception des Mūla-Sarvāstivādins, qui montrent encore sur d'autres points du canon une incontestable supériorité", *JA* (1912) 510); M. Hofinger in his study of the Second Council argues that the oldest extant accounts of these events are preserved in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-* and *Mahāsāṅghika-vinayas* (M. Hofinger, *Étude sur le concile de vaiçālī* (Louvain: 1946) 235—41; 256); I myself have suggested that the account of the remains of the former Buddha Kāśyapa found in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* appears from every angle to be earlier than the standardized, revised, and probably conflated accounts found in our other *Vinayas* (G. Schopen, "Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism: The Layman/Monk Distinction and the Doctrines of the Transference of Merit", *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 10 (1985) 18—22). If these divergent opinions and observations suggest a state of some uncertainty concerning the date of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, then their presentation has succeeded in representing the actual state of our knowledge. We simply know very little that is definitive about it — the illusion, of course, is that we know anything more about the dates of our other *Vinayas*, including that preserved in Pāli. It does, however, seem that there is mounting evidence that the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* — whatever its date or the degree of its "remaniement" — contains a good deal of very early material. The rules concerning monastic funerals may, in fact, be just another case in point.

[70] For the Sanskrit translated by *rim gro bya ba* see L. Chandra, *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary* (New Delhi: 1961) 2268—69, and note that Sanskrit *satkāra* when not actually a "w.r. for *saṃskāra*", can itself in one form or another mean "doing (the last) honour (to the dead), cremation of a corpse, funeral obsequies", "to pay the last honours to (acc.), cremate", etc. M. Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Oxford: 1899) 1134. Note too that — as has already been pointed out — Sanskrit accounts of monastic funerals do not always use the expression *śarīra-pūjā*: at *Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 2, 118.15, for example, we find *bhikṣavas tam ādāya dahanaṃ gatāḥ . . . bhikṣavas tam ādahane saṃskārya vihāram āgatāḥ*; at iii 2, 125.14: *bhikṣavas tam ādahanaṃ nītvā saṃskārya vihāram āgatāḥ*.

[71] Although it contains some details not yet found in the texts, I-tsing's description of a monastic funeral also contains — in one form or another — the same basic elements — Takakusu, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practiced in India and the Malay Archipelago*, 81—82; Bareau, *ACF* 1989—1990, 636.

[72] It would appear from Jain's remarks (*Life in Ancient India as Depicted in the Jain Canon and Commentaries*, 281—84; *JOIB* 38 (1988) 123—31) that the funeral of a dead Jain monk too was by preference and when at all possible an exclusively monastic affair. But Jain sources explicitly legislate for contingencies: "The question of carrying the dead [monk] for disposal was rather complicated . . . If there were only one single monk and it was not possible for him to carry the dead, ascetics belonging to non-Jain religion or laymen should be called, or help should be taken from the members of the Mallagaṇa, the Hastipālagaṇa or the Kumbhakāragaṇa, or in the absence of these a village-headman, *cāṇḍalas*, people from degraded castes, sweepers, barbers and others should be approached". It is not impossible that the Buddhist *Vinayas* also contained such legislation and it simply has not been recognized as such. The well-known passage which we associate with the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*, and which has been taken wrongly to establish that "śarīrapūjā, the worship of relics, is the

concern of the laity and not the bhikṣusaṃgha" (Schopen, *From Benares to Beijing*, 187—88), may be in fact just such legislation. In the passage in question (Sanskrit 36.2—3; Pāli V.10) Ānanda asks how the funereal *śarīra-pūjā* for the Buddha could be performed and the Buddha responds in the Sanskrit version: *alpotsukas tvam ānanda bhava śarīrapūjāyāḥ. prasannā brāhmaṇagṛhapataya etad āpādayiṣyanti* — all of the other known versions are essentially similar: Pāli, " 'ne soyez pas occupés (*avyāvaṭā tumhe hotha*) du culte [à rendre au] corps du Tathāgata' "; Chinese D, " 'ne vous souciez pas de cette affaire' "; Chinese A and C, " 'restez tranquilles' "; etc. All versions as well indicate essentially the same reason why Ānanda need not be concerned: " 'les pieux brahmanes et maîtres de maison (*gṛhapati*) s'en chargeront' " (all quotations are from Bareau, *Recherches sur la biographie du buddha dans les sūtrapiṭaka et les vinayapiṭaka anciens*: II. *les derniers mois, le parinirvāṇa et les funérailles*, t.II, 36—37). Previous interpretations of this passage — and they have been many — have it seems never asked why Ānanda should have been so concerned in the first place. They have, moreover, failed to take into account, among other things, that the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* was almost certainly a piece of *Vinaya*; that the Buddha's declaration came at almost the very end of the various *Vinayas* and certainly at the very end of the narrative time or internal chronology assumed by the canonical texts; and that — finally — Ānanda found himself, in so far as we can tell, alone. This would mean in terms of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, for example, that by the time the reader or redactor of this *Vinaya* had reached this passage he would have seen or inserted both sets of rules governing monastic funerals that we have looked at here, and a host of narrative descriptions of monastic funerals, in all of which it was monks and monks alone who did and were explicitly directed to perform the funeral of a fellow-monk. But — again in so far as we can tell — Ānanda found himself alone or virtually so. He could not therefore fulfill the *Vinaya* rule. This situation can explain well Ānanda's concern, the Buddha's assurance, and the sense of the passage: the Buddha was allowing an exception to the rule. This interpretation, though differing markedly from others, is perhaps worth pursuing. It is also perhaps worth noting that it — or some residual sense that Ānanda had indeed broken the rule — may explain too one of the charges brought against Ānanda by Mahākāśyapa at "the council of Rājagṛha". Among other things and in all versions, Ānanda is criticized, in fact charged with a fault (*duṣkṛta*), for having allowed apparently unauthorized individuals — lay men, nuns, and especially women — to participate in what could only have been the funereal *śarīra-pūjā*: most of the versions emphasize that the women saw the Buddha's penis, and that could only have happened during the preparation of the body before it was wrapped (see, for the various accounts, J. Przyluski, *Le concile de rājagṛha. Introduction a l'histoire des canons et des sectes bouddhiques* (Paris: 1926—28) 15, 50—51, 64, 153, 157, etc.).

[73] The role of ghosts, demons, etc. in the promulgation of Vinaya rules would make an interesting topic of study. In both the Pāli *Vinaya* (i 149 ff) and the *Mūlasarvāsti-vāda-vinaya* (*Gilgit Manuscripts* iii 4, 149 ff), for example, problems with or the presence of *piśāca* or *amanuṣyas* are cited as legitimate causes for cutting short the rain retreat, an act which otherwise was forbidden. Again in the Pāli *Vinaya* the case of a monk who had "a non-human affliction" (*amanussikābādha*) or was "possessed" prompted the Buddha to allow monks to eat raw flesh and drink blood (*Pāli Vinaya* i, 202, I. B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*, Vol. IV (London: 1951) 274 n. 6); etc.

It would appear, moreover, from Jain's remarks that many of the rules governing Jain monastic funerals were also connected with the fear of "ghosts": "If these rites are not followed, it is possible that some deity might enter the dead body, rise, play and create disturbances to the saṅgha" (*JOIB* 38 (1988) 127).

[74] Unfortunately, the material studied here makes little specific reference to nuns and in this it is probably typical of textual sources on the whole and unrepresentative of what actually occurred (see G. Schopen, "Monks, Nuns and 'Vulgar' Practices: The Introduction of the Image Cult into Indian Buddhism", *Artibus Asiae* 49.1/2 (1988/89) 153—68, esp. 163 ff). It is, however, true that none of the inscribed — and therefore certain — stūpas of the local monastic dead found at Indian monastic sites was erected for a nun (see Schopen, *JIABS* 14.2 (1991)). The subject requires — and will undoubtedly reward — future research.